

THE MADRAS LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Thursday, 24th November 1955.

The House met in the Assembly Chamber, Government Estate, Mount Road, at nine of the clock, Mr. Speaker (THE HON. SRI N. GOPALA MENON) in the Chair.

I.—QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

STARRED QUESTIONS.

Reorganization of States

* 2798 Q.—SRI K. C. GOPALAN UNNI: Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state—

(a) whether this Government have suggested to the States Reorganization Commission that Gudalur taluk and Attapady valley should be included in Tamil Nad; and

(b) if so, the reasons therefor?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM: (a) This Government have written to the States Reorganization Commission urging that the Gudalur taluk of the Nilgiris district should be retained in the Madras State in any scheme of reorganization of States in South India. They have not, however, made any suggestion regarding Attapady valley.

(b) The important reasons for making the above recommendation are—

(i) the Nilgiris district is of vital importance to this State from the economic and financial points of view as it contains the main sources of hydro-electric power available for this State, and it is one of the few areas where there are good forests and plantations in this State. The Pykara and Moyar Hydro-electric Projects are already functioning, while the Kunda Project will be taken up for execution shortly. The Moyar river is important not only from the point of view of electric power in this State but also as a very important tributary of the Bhavani river, and it runs along the eastern boundary of Gudalur taluk receiving the drainage of a good portion of that taluk. From the point of view of irrigation and supply of electric power, it is necessary that this State should retain complete control over the whole length of the Moyar river. For stabilizing and extending irrigation from the Bhavani river, this Government have recently completed the Bhavanisagar Project at considerable expense;

(ii) if, as may happen sooner or later, the Malabar and South Kanara districts are taken out of this State, Gudalur taluk will be one of the very few forest areas left for supply of teak;

(iii) the Mudumalai Reserved Forest in Gudalur taluk is not only an important catchment area for the Moyar river, but is also the only Game Sanctuary in this State; and

[24th November 1955]

(iv) Nilgiris is a convenient administrative unit in this State, with distinctive features, and, for the reasons mentioned above, its integrity should not be disturbed.

Sir, I am sure, I will be dealing with this aspect again when I reply to the debate. I do not think we need spend time on supplementaries.

SRI K. C. GOPALAN UNNI : Is it the view of this Government that areas where sources of power and irrigation facilities are situated in the State should be allowed to remain in the new Tamil State even though the people in those areas are Malayalees?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : With regard to population figures I will be dealing with them in my reply to the debate. That is why I do not want to include them in the reply which was given up till now. I am sure I will be able to satisfy hon. Members that even with regard to the population, the Gudalur taluk has to remain with the Madras State rather than with Malabar.

SRI K. KUNHI MOHAMED SHAFEE : Sir, as a Government functioning for the whole of Madras State as it is composed at present, had the Government in view the welfare of the district of Malabar when they made such recommendations to the States Reorganization Commission?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : We are fully aware of the interests of Malabar and I may tell the hon. Member that we are trying our best to the best of our ability to look after the interests of Malabar also. But simply because we happen to be functioning along with Malabar and South Kanara districts we cannot afford to abdicate our responsibility to the other portions of the State also.

SRI V. R. KRISHNA AYYAR : May I know whether, before the Government was moved by strategic as against linguistic considerations in the matter of Gudalur, the Government consulted any public organizations or popular representatives other than inspired ones which have recently come up?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : I know the hon. Member is a leading criminal lawyer and is an expert in putting leading questions. It is not a question of strategic considerations as against linguistic considerations. As I already said, even on linguistic considerations we have got a case for retaining Gudalur in Madras State.

SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP : Apart from the memorandum that was submitted by this Government to the States Reorganization Commission, may I know whether subsequently also this Government submitted any memorandum to the Central Government on this issue?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : Yes, Sir. Even subsequent to the publication of the report we have made further

24th November 1955]

representations to the Government of India and the authorities concerned. We have dealt with these various aspects arising out of the S.R.C's Report and incidentally we have mentioned about Gudalur also.

SRI D. KRISHNAMURTHI GOUNDER : இந்த அத்திப்பட்டு பள்ளத்தாக்கு எந்த ஜில்லாவில் எந்த தாலுகாவில் இருக்கிறதென்று தெரிவிப்பார்களா? இதைத் தவிர வேறு ஏதாவது அபிப்பிராயம் தெரிவித்திருக்கிறார்களா?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : அத்திப்பட்டு 'வாலி' மலபார் ஜில்லாவில் இருக்கிறது.

SRI P. K. GOPALAKRISHNAN : May I know what is the source of linguistic information that the Government have got? As far as we know, we have got only the Census Handbook. Regarding Nilgiris district this gives information with regard to language groups for the whole district only and not taluk-war whereas the information taluk-war has been given with regard to other districts. With regard to the Nilgiris district what is the source of information?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : In 1951 Census Book only the language picture with reference to each district is given. But in the statistics taken with reference to each individual the language also has been entered in the census slips. That is why with reference to all these disputed areas or areas in which the disputes are likely to arise research has been done with regard to each individual slip. Therefore we have figures available with regard to each village and these figures have been compiled by the Government of India. It is only with reference to these figures, these linguistic statistics are being furnished.

SRI M. NARAYANAN NAMBIAR : May I know whether any mention has been made in the report submitted to the Government of India with regard to Kasaragod taluk also?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : Yes, Sir. We have made representations with reference to Kasaragod taluk.

SRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM : கனம் மந்திரி அவர்கள் முன்னொரு சமயம் கொடுத்த புள்ளி விவரங்களிலிருந்து கூடலூர் தாலுக்காவில் ஒரு பகுதியில்கூட தமிழர்கள் பெரும்பாலோராக இல்லைமென்று சொல்லியிருக்கிறார். இந்தத் தாலுக்காவை சென்னை ராஜ்யத்துடன் இணைக்க வேண்டுமென்பதற்காகக் கடைப்பிடிக்கும் கொள்கையையே மற்ற எல்லைத் தகராறு உள்ள பிரதேசங்களுக்கும் கடைப்பிடிக்க மற்ற ராஜ்யங்கள் அனுமதிக்கப்படுமா என்று கேட்கிறேன்.

9-10
a.m.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : Sir, as far as I am concerned and the Government are concerned, we want a uniform principle to be adopted in all cases and that is our anxiety. But, unfortunately, one principle is adopted in one case which upsets at one point and another principle is adopted in another case which upsets at another point. If as a result of the application of any uniform principle, any territory or any portion of territory has to be handed over to any other State, certainly this Government won't stand in the way. But we want the adoption of a uniform principle.

[24th November 1955]

Labour disputes

* 2799 Q.—SRI K. MOIDU : Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state with reference to the answer to a supplementary question put on 5th May 1954 in connection with question No. 503, what steps the Government have taken to find employment for the workers of Pappinisseri Spinning and Weaving Mills who have been thrown out of employment for the last several months?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : The assets of the Aaron Spinning and Weaving Mills were brought to auction by the Debenture Trustees. The purchasers at the auction have started the working of the mill as a new company under the name of the Western India Cottons, Limited, Pappinisseri, from 6th June 1955. The Government have been able to persuade the new company to re-employ as many ex-workers of the Aaron Mills as possible in the interest of smooth relationship, though the new company are not legally under any obligation to do so. Out of 414 workers entertained in the company so far, 359 are ex-workers of Aaron Spinning and Weaving Mills. Out of about 12,000 spindles taken over 5,000 are now working and the remainder can be worked only when the machinery spares at present on order are received. Out of 407 looms, 150 are now working. The rest of the looms are being re-conditioned and, as this work progresses, further looms will be worked as early as possible.

SRI T. C. NARAYANAN NAMBIAR : Sir, in view of the fact that the figures given by the Hon. Minister are not exactly correct—this fact has been discussed previously with the new management of the Western India Cottons, Limited—and as there is unrest among the mill workers since the management did not adopt any principle with regard to the re-employment of the old workers of the Aaron Mills Workers' Union and the Government also wanted to provide the old workers as far as possible, will the Government see that a responsible officer from the Government side is sent there to discuss the matter and settle the question and see that the ex-workers of the Aaron Mills are employed with due consideration to the past service of the workers?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : Sir, the figures I have given may not certainly be up to date and correct because the management might have, since my collecting the figures, employed some more ex-workers of the Aaron Mills, but, as I have said in my answer, the Government have examined the position. It is considered to be a new mill and Government cannot legally compel the management to take particular workers or the old workers. But still the management have given an assurance and the Government are satisfied that the present management are taking mostly the ex-workers of the Aaron Mills.

SRI K. P. GOPALAN : Sir, are the Government aware that there was a judgment by the High Court in respect of a case in Salem in which it was held that even if a factory is closed

24th November 1955]

and when a new management comes in, the service conditions of the old workers must be taken into account and that the old workers must be taken according to their service? Are the Government also aware of the fact that the Industrial Disputes (Amendment) Act passed by the Central Government emphatically says that even if a factory is closed either temporarily or permanently, the service conditions of the old workers must be taken into account? May I know from the Hon. Minister whether it is not an illegal thing that the management have done and if so, will the Government issue directions to the management to take in the old workers? May I also know whether it is not a fact that the new management has taken up the stand that whenever the workers want to come to the factory (even the old workers) must take a written permit from the Union which they have sponsored recently? Will the Government take into consideration all these things and see that all the old workers are taken back and issue directions to the management to follow that principle very strictly?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM: The hon. Member referred to this judgment on a previous occasion and the Government have thoroughly examined the legal position with reference to that judgment. They have also examined the position with reference to the Industrial Disputes (Amendment) Act which was mentioned by the hon. Member. The Government have been definitely advised that these considerations would not apply in this case and that Government cannot compel the management to take back particular workers. Perhaps the workers who have been taken back—most of them are the ex-workers of the Aaron Mills—do not affiliate themselves with the Union in which the hon. Member is interested and probably that causes a lot of grievance.

SRI T. C. NARAYANAN NAMBIAR: Sir, on a point of personal explanation.

MR. SPEAKER: I would request the hon. Member to put short supplementary questions.

SRI T. C. NARAYANAN NAMBIAR: Sir, I am bound to inform the Hon. Minister that as the President of the Union I can assure him we are more interested in the amelioration of the conditions of the workers and in maintaining the unity of the working classes and we stand by the principle of one union for one industry. It is not as if we want to disrupt the unity of the working classes. May I request the Hon. Minister to see that the management does not exploit the poverty of the workers and the disunity among them which was caused by the management itself and that the concessions already granted to the workers by the State Regulations and Acts are not taken away?

SRI K. VINAYAKAM: Sir, on a point of order. I believe that my hon. Friend rose up to offer a personal explanation and the Chair has allowed him to explain. But he has utilized the opportunity and has put it in the form of a question. Is it in order for the Hon. Minister to get up and answer that question?

[24th November 1955]

MR. SPEAKER : It is perfectly in order if the Hon. Minister gets up to answer that question. But it may not be in order to put a long supplementary question, advancing arguments.

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : Sir, I can only say this much in answer to the supplementary question, namely, that Government will see that no exploitation of the workers by the management is resorted to, to the extent possible.

SRI V. R. KRISHNA AYYAR : Sir, may I know whether the Government have issued any clear, unambiguous and unmistakable instructions to the management concerned that to whichever Union the worker may belong, seniority in past service should be taken into account when making fresh appointments in the new mills?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : As I have already explained, the Government cannot issue any mandatory instructions, but in the presence of the hon. Member who is the President of the previous Union and in the presence of one of the representatives of the management, we had a thorough discussion and an understanding was arrived at that the management will take mostly the ex-workers of the Union, perhaps with the exception of a few individuals.

SRI K. P. GOPALAN : Sir, are the Government aware that when new workers are taken, workers with more service are taken as temporary workers and apprentices and are the Government also aware that the workers are not paid according to the Venkataramanayya Award and in accordance with the scales of pay paid in other mills not only in Malabar but also in Tamil Nad? Will the Government be pleased to set right these matters immediately?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : I would once again request the hon. Member to bear in mind the basis on which the whole thing has to be looked into. We cannot issue any mandates, but at the same time, if there is any grievance that the minimum wages are not paid to the workers, the Government will look into the question.

MR. SPEAKER : Question Nos. 2800 and 2801 will be taken up together.

Labour disputes

9 20 a.m. * 2800 Q.—SRI N. K. PALANISAMY : Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state whether the 68 workers of Mahaganapathi Mills, Pudukkottai, have been reinstated as per the 1954 award of the Madurai Industrial Tribunal?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : The Pudukkottai Mill Labour Union and the management of Mahaganapathy Spinning Mills, Limited came to a settlement according to which

24th November 1955]

the management reinstated 63 out of the 68 workers with effect from 16th July 1955 and the rest of the workers would be reinstated in future vacancies.

* 2801 Q.—SRI N. K. PALANISAMY: Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have sanctioned in March 1955, the prosecution of the management of the Ganapathi Mills, Pudukkottai, for not implementing the Madura Industrial Tribunal Award of 1954 to reinstate 68 retrenched workers; and

(b) whether the prosecution has been launched?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM: (a) & (b) The Government sanctioned in March 1955 the prosecution of the management of the mills for having changed the conditions of service of the workers and thus contravening section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. In pursuance of clause 8 of the Memorandum of Settlement, dated 26th May 1955, arrived at by the Pudukkottai Mill Labour Union and the management of the Mahaganapathi Mills, the Government have, however, stayed proceedings of the prosecution.

As regards the reinstatement of the 68 retrenched workers the attention of the hon. Member is invited to my answer to his question No. 2800 (answered on 24th November 1955).

SRI N. K. PALANISAMY: இந்த அவார்ட் கொடுக்கப்பட்டது 1954-ம் வருஷம் மே மாதத்தில். ஸ்டே கொடுத்ததற்குப் பிறகு ஸ்டே வகை ஆகஸ்ட் மாதத்தில். ஆனால் ஸ்டே கொடுத்ததற்குப் பிறகு ஸ்டே வகை செய்யப்பட்டது. அதற்குப் பிறகு சர்க்கார் ஒன்றும் நடவடிக்கை எடுக்கவில்லை. இடைஸ்டிரியல் டிஸ்புட் ஆக்ட் 29-வது செக்ஷன் பிரகாரம் அவார்ட் பாஸ் செய்து பதினைந்து நாட்கள் வரையில் அமல் நடத்தாமல் இருந்தால் மில் முதலாளிகளின் பேரில் நடவடிக்கை எடுத்து பிராசிக்ஷன் பண்ணவேண்டுமென்றிருக்கிறது. இப்படியிருந்தும் சர்க்கார் ஏன் முதலாளிகளின் பேரில் நடவடிக்கை எடுக்கவில்லை? இதைப்போலவே அநேகம் முதலாளிகள் அவார்ட் பாஸ் பண்ணிய பிறகு மேல் நடவடிக்கை எடுக்காமல் இருக்கிறார்கள். அவர்கள் மேல் ஏன் சர்க்கார் நடவடிக்கை எடுப்பது இல்லை?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM: சர்க்கார் இந்த விஷயத்தில் முதலில் பிராசிக்ஷன் சாங்கஷன் செய்தார்கள். ஆனால் அதற்குப்பிறகு தொழிலாளர்களும் முதலாளிகளும் சேர்ந்து “நாங்கள் சமாதானம் செய்து கொள்ளுகிறோம்” என்று சொன்னதனால் நடவடிக்கை எடுப்பது நிறுத்திவைக்கப்பட்டது.

* 2802 Q.—SRI R. S. ARUMUGAM: Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have received any petition from the Secretary, Thesiya Panjalai Tholilalar Union, Ganapathy Mills, Thalaisyuthu, on 19th July 1955 regarding the compulsory discharge of some mill labourers by the management by obtaining their signature in blank papers with the help of the police and using them as resignation letters; and

(b) if so, what action has been taken on the petition?

[24th November 1955]

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : (a) No, Sir. The Labour Officer, Tirunelveli, however, received a petition, dated 22nd July 1955, from Sri Padagalingam Pillai and a letter, dated 24th July 1955, from the National Textile Workers' Union regarding the dismissal of Sri Padagalingam Pillai from Sri Ganapathy Mills, Thalaiyuthu.

(b) Conciliation was held and the Government, after considering the report decided that there was no case for adjudication. The Union has been informed accordingly.

SRI V. BALAKRISHNAN : பிராசிசுஷன் ஒத்தி வைத்ததற்குப் பிறகு தொழிலாளர்களுக்கும் முதலாளிகளுக்கும் சமாதானம் ஏற்படவில்லை. அதனால் பிராசிசுஷன் நடவடிக்கை மீண்டும் முதலாளிகளின் பேரில் எடுக்கவேண்டும் என்று சர்க்காருக்கு தகவல் வந்ததா?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : இந்த உப கேள்வி முன் கேள்விக்குப் போட்டிருக்கவேண்டும். இருந்தாலும் அதற்குத் தனிக் கேள்வி போட்டால் அதற்கு பதில் சொல்லுகிறேன்.

SRI K. P. GOPALAN : The Hon. Minister did not say in his reply whether the management obtained the signatures of mill labourers in blank papers with the help of the police. May I know what he has got to say on that point?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : All these were original complaints. But the Government found that an enquiry was duly held. There was no flaw in the enquiry. The Government could not interfere because it was a matter of discipline.

* 2803 Q.—**SRI K. P. GOPALAN :** Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have received any conciliation report from the Labour Officer, Kozhikode, regarding the labour dispute between the workers and the management of Chenoli Mills, Kunhimangalam, North Malabar, on the question of bonus; and

(b) if so, the action taken thereon?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) The Government have referred the dispute for adjudication.

Pay of menials in panchayats

* 2804 Q.—**SRI G. GOVINDAN :** Will the Hon. the Minister for Health be pleased to state whether representations were made to raise the basic pay of menials working in panchayats to Rs. 20 ?

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY : No, Sir.

SRI S. DAIVASIGAMONEY : May I know the minimum wage that is paid to a menial working in a panchayat and whether the Government think that with that wage he could live in a decent condition?

24th November 1955]

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY : The minimum wage fixed under the Minimum Wages Act for sanitary workers is Rs. 25 per mensem, all inclusive.

SRI K. P. GOPALAN : May I know from the Hon. Minister what the basic salary is and what the allowance is under the Minimum Wages Act? Do the Government think that with this income it will be possible for a human being to live and will the Government be pleased to enhance the minimum wage?

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY : Minimum wages have been fixed by the Central Government.

SRI V. R. KRISHNA AYYAR : From the evasion of the Hon. Minister, it is obvious that the wage must be less than Rs. 20. May I ask him to have the wage fixed on a more socialistic scale?

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY : It may be considered under the new set-up.

Trunk-calls booked in Ramanathapuram Collectorate

* 2805 Q.—**SRI K. P. GOPALAN** (on behalf of Sri M. Kalyanasundaram) : Will the Hon. the Minister for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) the total expenditure incurred on trunk-calls by the Collectorate of Ramanathapuram for the month of March 1955; and

(b) how many calls were booked during the said month for places outside India like Ceylon and to whom such calls were booked?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU : (a) Rs. 103.

(b) No trunk-call has been booked during the said month for places outside India.

Tamil students in Anantapur Engineering College

* 2806 Q.—**SRI D. KRISHNAMURTHI GOUNDER** : Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(a) how many students were selected from the Tamil districts and sent to Anantapur Engineering course (B.E.) in the year 1953;

(b) how many of them were given merit scholarships;

(c) whether they received that scholarship now also;

(d) if not, why; and

(e) what steps the Government have taken to continue those scholarships to them?

[24th November 1955]

THE HON. SRI R. SHANMUGA RAJESWARA SETHUPATHI : (a) 34.

(b) Two.

(c) Yes, Sir.

(d) & (e) Does not arise.

Harijan uplift in Madurai

* 2807 Q.—SRI A. RATNAM : Will the Hon. the Minister for Religious Endowments and Transport be pleased to state—

(a) the extent of lands assigned to Harijans from the Government lands and by acquisition in the year 1952 in Madurai district;

(b) how many wells were sunk for the benefit of Harijans in the district in the year 1952;

(c) other ameliorative steps taken in Madurai district towards Harijan uplift since the present Collector took charge; and

(d) the expenditure incurred from the budget allotment for Harijan Welfare towards establishment charges in the Madurai district and the actual amount of subsidy and aid given for the uplift of Harijans in the year 1952?

THE HON. SRI B. PARAMESWARAN : (a) to (d) The information is furnished in the paper ^a placed on the table of the House.

Baliapatam Police

* 2808 Q.—SRI M. CHADAYAN : Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state the action taken by the Baliapatam Police in Malabar on the petition given by one Nanu (Harijan) of Kunnam Kayil near Cannanore regarding the carrying away by force of his wife Panchali (Thiyya) of Cheruthazham by a mob of Caste Hindus on 24th May 1955?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : A statement^b is placed on the table of the House.

SRI V. R. KRISHNA AYYAR : From the statement placed on the table, it is apparent that the woman Panchali really went out of love. May I request the Government to see that in respect of Harijans such conditions are created as will be conducive to the course of true love to run smoother?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : Anyhow we do not stand in the way of true love taking its own course.

^a Printed as Appendix I on pages 420–421 infra.

^b Printed as Appendix II on pages 421–422 infra.

24th November 1955]

Tractors in the Agriculture Department

* 2809 Q.—**SRI K. ARANGANATHAN** : Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state—

(a) the total number of tractors with the Agriculture Department now and the life period fixed for each category;

(b) the profit or loss in maintaining the tractors during 1953 and 1954; and

(c) if any loss was incurred, how the Government propose to make good the loss?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : (a) One hundred and fifty-nine. Seven years for all categories.

(b) Loss of Rs. 9,46,889 for the financial year 1952-53 and Rs. 10,30,405-12-5 for the financial year 1953-54. This includes figure for the Composite State for the first half-year.

(c) The levy of slightly enhanced hire charges has been ordered by the Government in G.O. Ms. No. 357, Agriculture (Food Production), dated 2nd December 1954, as a preliminary measure towards working the scheme on a “no-loss-no-profit basis”. Sanction has also been accorded by the Government for the grant of loans to agriculturists for meeting the hire charges for the departmental tractors and a sum of Rs. 7 lakhs has been provided by the State for this purpose.

SRI K. ARANGANATHAN : May I know whether the Government have so far granted any loans for meeting hire charges for the departmental tractors?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : I would like to have notice to answer this question.

SRI V. BALAKRISHNAN : Have the rates of hire charges been reduced in Block Development areas as has been requested by the Block Development Committee?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : I would like to have notice. I suppose the rates will be uniform in all areas.

SRI S. RAMALINGAM : யந்திரக் கலப்பைகளின் வாடகை அதிகமாக இருப்பதால் சிறிய விவசாயிகள் அவைகளை வாங்கி உபயோகப்படுத்த முடியாமல் இருக்கிறார்கள். அதனால் மக்கள் எல்லோரும் உபயோகப்படுத்தக்கூடிய முறையில் குறைந்த வாடகைக்குக் கிடைப்பதற்கு ஏற்பாடு செய்ய சர்க்கார் முன்வருமா?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : வாடகையைக் குறைத்தால் சர்க்காருக்கு நஷ்டம் ஏற்படும். சின்ன டிராக்டர்களை வாங்கி அவைகளை குறைந்த வாடகைக்கு விடலாமா என்று சர்க்கார் யோசித்துக்கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள். அப்படிச் சொடுக்கும்போது வாடகையையும் குறைக்கமுடியும்.

SRI K. ARANGANATHAN : Are the Government aware of the fact that the tractors are placed only at the headquarters of the district and that they are not available in the far-off taluks in the district? As such, may I request the Hon. Minister to see that the tractors are placed at least for two taluks in one place? 9-30 a.m.

[24th November 1955]

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : That proposal has been examined by the Government. The Government found it more economical to keep it in the district headquarters, but that should not prevent easy access of these tractors to the areas concerned.

SRI K. R. SAMBANDAM : இந்த டிராக்டர்களின் எண்ணிக்கை மிகவும் குறைவாக இருக்கிறபடியாலும் அதனால் விவசாயிகளுடைய வேண்டுகோளை பூர்த்தி செய்ய முடியாத நிலையில் இருப்பதாலும் இன்னும் அதிகப்படியான டிராக்டர்களை வாங்குவதற்கு சர்க்கார் முன் வருமா என்று கேட்கிறேன்.

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : இப்பொழுது இருக்கிற டிராக்டர்களின் காலம் டிப்ரிசியேஷன் கணக்குப்படி முடிந்து விட்டது. இருந்தாலும் அவைகள் வேலை செய்துகொண்டிருக்கின்றன. இன்னும் புதிய டிராக்டர்களையும் வாங்கலாமா என்று கவர்ன்மென்ட் யோசித்துக் கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள்.

SRI V. BALAKRISHNAN : டிராக்டர்கள் உழுவதைக் காட்டிலும் யானைகளைக் கட்டி உழுதால் செலவு குறைவாக இருக்குமாதலால் யானைகளைக் கட்டி உழுவதற்கு சர்க்கார் ஏற்பாடு செய்வார்களா ?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : புதுக்கோட்டைக் காடுகளில் யானை இருக்குமா என்று கனம் அங்கத்தினருடைய அனுபவத்தைக் கொண்டு சொன்னால் அதை யோசித்துப் பார்க்கலாம்.

Hospital at Valparai

* 2810 Q.—**SRI N. K. PALANISAMY :** Will the Hon. the Minister for Health be pleased to state—

(a) the cost of construction of the hospital at Valparai, Anamalai Hills, Coimbatore district; and

(b) the number of patients treated in that hospital during 1954?

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY : (a) The exact cost of construction of the buildings is not known. The estimated value of the buildings, including staff quarters in 1915, was Rs. 35,000.

(b) In-patients 99. Out-patients 3,580.

SRI N. K. PALANISAMY : The cost of the building is more than Rs. 10 lakhs. But only about 2,000 people are attending the hospital every year. Thus, since very few people have been treated in the hospital, why have the Government spent a lot on the building?

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY : This hospital must have been built many years ago. I cannot say why so much amount was spent.

Damage caused to stamps by white-ants

* 2811 Q.—**SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP :** Will the Hon. the Minister for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether any loss was incurred by the Government in 1951-52 due to damage caused to stamps by white-ants; and

24th November 1955]

(b) if so, whether any action was taken against the persons concerned?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU : (a) There was no loss to the Government in 1951-52 due to damage caused to stamps by white-ants in the districts comprised in the present Madras State.

(b) Does not arise.

SRI V. R. KRISHNA AYYAR : Whether loss was caused or not, was damage caused by white-ants to stamps?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU : Yes, Sir. During the Andhra partition, the white ants were allotted to the Andhra State. (Laughter.) The damage took place in the Gunjur Treasury.

SRI T. C. NARAYANAN NAMBIAR : Will the Hon. Minister see that at least during the partition that is going to take place between Kerala and Andhra the white-ants are not allotted to the new Kerala State?

Inspection bungalow at Hasthampatti

* 2812 Q.—SRI S. SWAYAMPRAKASAM (on behalf of Sri P. Rangaswami Reddiar) : Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(a) when the Public Works Department Inspection Bungalow at Hasthampatti, Salem district, was constructed and at what cost;

(b) the average annual cost of maintenance during the years 1952-55;

(c) when it was last repaired;

(d) whether it is a fact that the First Member of the Board of Revenue narrowly escaped from injuries, when one of the wooden rafters suddenly fell down from the roof, while he was sleeping in this bungalow during a night in March 1955;

(e) whether he complained to the authorities about the unsatisfactory maintenance of the bungalow;

(f) whether any enquiry was conducted against the officials of the Public Works Department and if so, with what result; and

(g) whether the bungalow has since been inspected and repaired?

THE HON. SRI R. SHANMUGA RAJESWARA SETHUPATHI : (a) The Inspection Bungalow which was formerly the

[24th November 1955]

residence of the Executive Engineer till 1948 was constructed in the year 1862. The cost of construction with subsequent improvements is Rs. 14,796.

(b) Rs. 530 per year.

(c) In September 1954.

(d) Only a wooden collar connecting one set of rafters fell down about three feet away from the bed of the Board Member.

(e) Yes.

(f) Necessary enquiries were made. But it was found that the mishap was purely accidental for which none of the Public Works Department Officers could be held responsible.

(g) The bungalow was inspected on 8th April 1955 immediately after the accident and necessary repairs and improvements at a cost of Rs. 4,300 have been carried out.

SRI V. R. KRISHNA AYYAR : Have the Government made necessary arrangements for insurance of occupants of these bungalows?

THE HON. SRI R. SHANMUGA RAJESWARA SETHUPATHI : That is a different question, Sir. It is for the occupants to consider.

Harijan Welfare School Teachers

* 2813 Q.—SRI C. KUNHIRAMA KURUP : Will the Hon. the Minister for Religious Endowments and Transport be pleased to state why the Harijan Welfare teachers in the State have not received any increment in their pay from 1947 to 1954?

THE HON. SRI B. PARAMESWARAN : It is not a fact, Sir. The increments of the Harijan Welfare school teachers in the districts of Tiruchirappalli, Ramanathapuram, Madurai, South Kanara, Coimbatore, the Nilgiris and Madras have been claimed and paid up to date. In the remaining districts also except South Arcot increments to the teachers have since been sanctioned and arrangements for the drawal of arrears are being made. The Collector of South Arcot has been asked to see that the increments are sanctioned by the end of this year.

SRI T. C. NARAYANAN NAMBIAR : Will the Hon. Minister be pleased to state on what date orders have been passed with regard to Malabar district?

THE HON. SRI B. PARAMESWARAN : The Collector was asked to see that the work was completed by the 5th September 1955. I have information that the work has been completed now.

SRI K. UPPI : May I know whether increments sanctioned to the Harijan Welfare School teachers were not paid in Malabar for the last three or four years?

24th November 1955]

THE HON. SRI B. PARAMESWARAN : I said that because there was not adequate staff, there was some delay. Now that special staff has been sanctioned, the work is almost completed.

SRI K. ARANGANATHAN : Is the Hon. Minister aware of the fact that Service Registers have not been maintained for the last three or four years for the teachers in Harijan Welfare schools in South Arcot district? It is not even possible with the existing staff to bring all the Service Registers up to date within a short time. As such, may I request the Hon. Minister to increase the staff for that section so that the Service Registers may be maintained up to date and increments passed early?

THE HON. SRI B. PARAMESWARAN : It is true that Service Registers were not maintained not only in South Arcot district but in other districts also. But the work in South Arcot district does not warrant sanction of additional staff. Therefore, the Collector has been asked to carry on the work without additional staff. He has promised to do so by the end of this year. If by the end of this year the work is not completed, we will consider the question of increase of staff.

Admission Committees of Government Colleges

* 2814 Q.—SRI V. R. KRISHNA AYYAR : Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have laid down any rules regarding the appointment of members to the Admission Committees of Government Colleges; and

(b) if so, whether a copy of these rules will be laid on the table of the House?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : (a) No, Sir.

(b) Does not arise.

SRI V. R. KRISHNA AYYAR : May I know whether the appointments are made *ad hoc* annually and capriciously?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : They are no doubt made *ad hoc* annually. I do not know about capriciousness. That is left to the hon. Member to judge.

Government Milk Factory, Teynampet

* 2815 Q.—SRI P. RANGASWAMI REDDIAR : Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state—

(a) the cost of the machinery originally set up in the Government Milk Factory at Teynampet for the production of reconstituted milk;

(b) whether any additional machinery has been set up for the production of toned milk in the said factory and if so the cost thereof;

(c) the normal production of milk in that factory;

[24th November 1955]

(d) the average annual profit during the past three years from the said factory;

(e) the relative advantages and disadvantages between the reconstituted milk and toned milk;

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM: (a) The cost of machinery originally set up in the Government Milk Factory for the production of reconstituted milk was Rs. 3,32,835.

(b) No additional machinery has so far been set up for the production of toned milk in the factory.

(c) The present normal daily production of toned milk in the factory is about 4,000 to 5,000 lb.

(d) The average of the profit for three years ending 1953-54 is Rs. 25,471.

(e) The Expert Committee constituted by the Government under the Chairmanship of Dr. Lakshmanaswamy Mudaliar to examine the working of the Government Milk Factory, reported that the preparation of reconstituted milk was not satisfactory as shown by the biological examination of the nutritive value of the reconstituted milk. The Government on the recommendation of the Expert Committee, have therefore ordered the manufacture of toned milk in the factory, which has been found to be equivalent in nutritive value to fresh cow's milk on analysis by the Biochemistry Department of the Madras University.

Hospitals and rural dispensaries without doctors

* 2816 Q.—SRI N. K. PALANISAMY: Will the Hon. the Minister for Health be pleased to state the number of hospitals and rural dispensaries in the State that are without doctors from 1st January 1955?

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY: The number of hospitals and rural dispensaries that were without doctors for short periods from 1st January 1955 are 20 and 68 respectively.

SRI N. K. PALANISAMY: May I know whether there is any proposal before the Government to provincialize the rural dispensaries and hospitals?

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY: There is a proposal for provincializing some of them during the Second Five-Year Plan period.

SRI K. ARANGANATHAN: May I know whether any dispensary has been closed for a short time during this period?

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY: That is what I said. Twenty regular hospitals and dispensaries and 68 rural dispensaries remained closed.

24th November 1955]

SRI V. R. KRISHNA AYYAR : It is certainly a very unsatisfactory state of affairs that hospitals without doctors should exist in the State during the First Five-Year Plan and the Second Five-Year Plan periods. May I know whether the Government propose to solve the problem by increasing the salary of the doctors to be appointed?

THE HON SRI A. B. SHETTY : When the institutions are provincialized, they would be given better scales of pay. I hope that with the starting of a new Medical College for which provision is made in the Second Five-Year Plan, the number of doctors also will increase.

SRI K. VINAYAKAM : May I know, Sir, what work was exactly done in those hospitals and dispensaries in the absence of doctors? Was any medicine catered to the patients that came there and if so, by whom? Or, what happened to the medicines that were stored there? Were they all stolen away or pilfered away? What was the work done in those hospitals in the absence of doctors? 9-40 a.m.

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY : I have said that the hospitals and rural dispensaries were closed only for a short period till another doctor was posted to that place.

SRI S. RAMALINGAM : The Hon. Minister stated that the Government are considering a proposal to open another medical college. Is it at Tanjore, Sir.

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY : It may be opened at Tanjore, Sir, if there is good response from the local people and if a good portion of the amount is met by them.

SRI P. K. GOPALAKRISHNAN : Sir, we are told that at a Planning Board meeting, this Government have been asked to drop the proposal to open a medical college in Madras during the Second Plan and now it is stated that the Government want to open a medical college. Is it because that the Government have decided to separate Malabar? May I know, Sir, the correct position?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : The hon. Member is referring to something which happened in the Planning Board about which my hon. Colleague is not aware. Therefore, I may state that the Planning Commission is of the opinion that perhaps there may not be any necessity to have another medical college in our State. But, still we continue to press upon them that we should be permitted to open one more.

SRI V. R. KRISHNA AYYAR : Now that it is fairly certain that one more medical college is to be started, will I be letting out a secret if I say that the Government of Madras are struggling hard to have it in Kozhikode?

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY : Perhaps struggling hard to prevent the college being located at Kozhikode! That is what the hon. Member wants me to say.

. [24th November 1955

SRI K. VINAYAKAM : Sir, some three years back, the Hon. Minister for Health presided over a function in Ponvilanthakalathur near Chingleput to open a dispensary. On the same occasion, Dr. Varadarajalu Naidu also took part in that function. The hospital is still there without a doctor. Subsequently, it was known that no medicines were available. Only the closing ceremony was not presided over by a Minister. Does the Hon. Minister know all these things, Sir?

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY : This joke has been repeated *ad nauseam*. I do not think the hon. Member is giving any new information.

SRI K. PARTHASARATHY : Sir, when fully qualified medical practitioners are not available for appointment in rural dispensaries the Government have been appointing B Class practitioners for these dispensaries. Is it a fact, Sir, that even B Class practitioners are not available in sufficient numbers? Have the Government any proposal to train persons emergently to fill up the vacancies in the meantime before another medical college is established?

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY : Government have stated, Sir, that hereafter B Class practitioners who have not been trained in any institution recognized by the Government, should not be appointed to these dispensaries.

Exemption from sales-tax

* 2817 Q.—**SRI V. R. KRISHNA AYYAR :** Will the Hon. the Minister for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have received representations from the Tellicherry Milk Union in 1954-55 requesting for exemption from sales-tax for co-operative milk unions; and

(b) whether any decision has been taken thereon?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU : (a) Yes.

(b) At present sales-tax on sales of milk is levied only at one point, viz., the stage of sale to the consumer and this too only in respect of sales effected by milk supply societies and unions. The Government have decided that there are no grounds for granting total exemption in respect of all sales of milk.

SRI V. R. KRISHNA AYYAR : Since the infant unions find it very difficult to compete with small milk vendors and since it is very useful to have milk unions in every small town, may I know whether the Government have any proposal to make the first ten years of the union's life free from sales-tax for milk sales?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU : Sir, co-operative milk societies were paying sales-tax at different stages. Now we are levying it only at one stage. Unless there are some strong grounds, it will not be possible to consider the request.

24th November 1955]

SRI V. BALAKRISHNAN : Is the sales-tax on tinned milk or mother's milk, Sir?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU : Yes, Sir. It is cow's milk and not the milk which the hon. member is referring to.

* 2818 Q.—SRI P. K. GOPALAKRISHNAN : Will the Hon the Minister for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have received a representation, dated 30th May 1955 from Panangad Coconut-Jaggery Producers Co-operative Society, South Malabar, for exempting them from payment of sales-tax for the year 1954-55; and

(b) if so, the action taken thereon?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU : (a) Yes.

(b) It is under the consideration of the Government.

SRI P. K. GOPALAKRISHNAN : May I know, Sir, whether the Government will expedite consideration?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU : Yes. All considerations are generally being expedited.

Barapuzha Project

* 2819 Q.—SRI V. R. KRISHNA AYYAR : Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state whether the Government have investigated the irrigational possibilities in Malabar of the Barapuzha Project?

THE HON. SRI R. SHANMUGA RAJESWARA SETHUPATHI : The proposed project is located in the Coorg State and the question of investigating its irrigational possibilities in Malabar does not arise.

SRI V. R. KRISHNA AYYAR : Sir, although the project may be situated in the Coorg State, since its benefits may flow into the neighbouring areas, may I know whether the Government have investigated from that angle?

THE HON. SRI R. SHANMUGA RAJESWARA SETHUPATHI : Yes, Sir. We have to investigate from every angle. Perhaps the proposed Kerala State may tackle the question.

SRI T. C. NARAYANAN NAMBIAR : As the matter been represented to the Government of Madras and as the Madras Government were pleased to investigate with regard to the rivers in the Travancore-Cochin State where without coming to any expert opinion fifty-six lakhs of rupees have been allotted, will the Government see that the scheme is pushed through because it will go a long way to help Malabar?

THE HON. SRI R. SHANMUGA RAJESWARA SETHUPATHI : No. We have not investigated nor do we propose to investigate it. Because, as I have already pointed out, the Kerala State to be formed will be the fit Government to tackle this problem.

[24th November 1955]

Backward class students in Harijan hostels

* 2820 Q.—SRI S. RAMALINGAM (on behalf of Sri P. Venkatesha Sholagar) : Will the Hon. the Minister for Religious Endowments and Transport be pleased to state—

(a) the total number of seats allotted to the backward class students in the Harijan hostels run on Government grant in the Tanjore district for 1954–55; and

(b) how many students of the backward classes actually availed themselves of this facility?

THE HON. SRI B. PARAMESWARAN : (a) & (b) Boarding grants were sanctioned for 156 students. As many as 162 students availed themselves of this facility.

Annual deposit from school

* 2821 Q.—SRI V. R. KRISHNA AYYAR : Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state—

(a) the number of High schools in Malabar that have requested the Government to waive the rule requiring a deposit of Rs. 5,000 annually; and

(b) the action taken on their request?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : (a) & (b) : The Director of Public Instruction has been authorized to permit the managements of secondary schools to build up the endowment required (Rs. 35,000) in easy annual instalments of not less than Rs. 1,100 each. Representations from individual managements, are transferred to the Director, who will pass suitable orders in the matter.

Polytechnics

* 2822 Q.—SRI P. K. GOPALAKRISHNAN : Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state—

(a) the number of students that applied for each of the courses in the Kerala Polytechnic at Kozhikode; and

(b) the number of students selected for each course?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : (a) & (b) The number of students that applied for each of the courses in the Kerala Polytechnic, Kozhikode, and the number of students selected are given below :—

	Number of students that applied.	Number of students selected.
Civil Engineering	200	49
Chemical Engineering	19	19
Mechanical Engineering	48	31
Electrical Engineering	41	26
Food Technology	Nil.	25

24th November 1955]

* 2823 Q.—SRI K. VINAYAKAM : Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state—

(a) the number of students that applied for the various courses of study in the Central Polytechnic, Madras; and

(b) the number of students belonging to the forward classes, Backward Classes and Scheduled Classes that were admitted?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : (a) & (b) A statement ^a is placed on the table of the House.

SRI K. VINAYAKAM : In the statement that is placed on the Table of the House, regarding Backward Class students, the number eligible for admission is given as 244. Why then 227 candidates were interviewed out of which only 114 were taken?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : Sir, although there is a large number of applications of candidates who were eligible, in view of the limited number of seats available, all the applicants who are eligible were not interviewed. That is how the numbers vary.

SRI K. VINAYAKAM : If the number of seats available for admission is limited, should not the same rule be applied to the forward classes also with a corresponding reduction in the number of seats allotted to them. It is evident that 60 per cent of the seats have been given to the forward classes. That means the seats allotted to the backward classes have been taken away and given to the forward classes? 9.50 a.m.

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : There is nothing like that. The results are there. For Civil Engineering 43 candidates belonging to the Backward Classes were selected as against 62, for Electrical Engineering 23 as against 30 and for Mechanical Engineering 21 as against 37.

SRI V. BALAKRISHNAN : What is the total number of seats available. Hereafter, will the selection be made on a district-wise basis?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : The hon. Member may put a separate question.

Sub-Collector's bungalow at Tellicherry

* 2824 Q.—SRI V. R. KRISHNA AYYAR : Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have issued orders abandoning the Sub-Collector's bungalow at Tellicherry; and

(b) whether any portions in the compound of the building have slipped off into the sea?

[24th November 1955]

THE HON. SRI R. SHANMUGA RAJESWARA SETHUPATHI : (a) No sir.

(b) A portion of the compound wall to a length of about 25 feet slipped down due to sea erosion during the monsoon in July 1953, but immediate action was taken to repair the revetment to prevent further damage.

SRI V. R. KRISHNA AYYAR : Have the Government received any representation or complaint from the neighbouring high school authorities that their building is also endangered or jeopardised on account of lack of attention being paid to the preservation of the Sub-Collector's bungalow?

THE HON. SRI R. SHANMUGA RAJESWARA SETHUPATHI : I have no information about it. A separate question may be put.

Eviction of Harijans

* 2825 Q.—SRI A. RATNAM : Will the Hon. the Minister for Religious Endowments and Transport be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that 75 Harijan families living at the Corporation Old Basin Wharf, Waltax Road, Madras, have been served with eviction notices by the Corporation authorities without providing them alternative sites as required by the Government;

(b) whether any representation was received from the Harijan residents in May 1955 against their eviction; and

(c) if so, the action taken thereon?

THE HON. SRI B. PARAMESWARAN : (a) Eviction notices were served by the Corporation of Madras only on 50 Harijan families. They were evicted and accommodated in Thiru. Vi. Ka. Nagar. Fifteen families were also living in the Wharf as tenants under the 50 families. Action is being taken by the Corporation to provide them alternative sites in the Market Farm, Tondiarpet.

(b) Representations were received by the Director of Harijan Welfare and the Commissioner, Corporation of Madras.

(c) On an examination of the representation it was found that the site was acquired for the expansion of the Central Lorry Station and that as the expansion of the Lorry Station as well as Corporation workshop and construction of a school on that site had to be undertaken urgently, the Harijans had to be evicted. The 50 families have been given by the Government financial assistance at the rate of Rs. 10 per family to put up fresh huts on the new site. The Government considered that no further action was necessary on the representation.

24th November 1955]

Deputy Inspectors of Schools in Hosdrug Range

* 2826 Q.—SRI M. NARAYANAN NAMBIAR: Will the Hon the Minister for Finance be pleased to state—

(a) the number of Elementary and Higher Elementary schools in the Hosdrug Range in South Kanara;

(b) the number of Deputy Inspectors working in the range; and

(c) whether there is any proposal to increase the number of Deputy Inspectors in the range?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM: (a) There are 150 lower elementary schools and 19 higher elementary schools in the Hosdrug Range.

(b) Two.

(c) There is a general proposal for employing additional inspecting officers in the entire State.

SRI M. NARAYANAN NAMBIAR: May I know whether it is possible for the two Deputy Inspectors to inspect all the schools mentioned by the Hon. Minister?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM: Generally the maximum number allotted to a Deputy Inspector is 65. I do agree that here it is more than that number. That is why it is under the consideration of the Government to appoint more inspecting officers.

SRI M. NARAYANAN NAMBIAR: Since the area is without proper communications and other facilities to move about, I understand that the Deputy Inspectors are not able to cope with the work. So, will the Government consider the desirability of appointing one more Deputy Inspector at a very early date?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM: The hon. Member should also take into consideration the pending proposals for the reorganization of the State. Whether we should hand over to the other State some committed liabilities, is a matter for consideration for the Government and also for the hon. Member.

SRI V. R. KRISHNA AYYAR: May I know whether the Government will give this additional amenity to the people of that area by appointing an additional Inspector instead of waiting for the reorganization of the State?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM: As I have already stated, it is a matter to be considered, whether the liability will have to be taken by the Government which is taking over that area. It is alright for us to pay for some months but that will be a recurring liability for the other Government.

SRI T. C. NARAYANAN NAMBIAR: In view of the necessity for effective and helpful supervision of institutions like this, will the Government consider the feasibility of appointing a new cadre of Supervisors instead of Deputy Inspectors?

[24th November 1955]

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM: The question of appointment of inspecting personnel for these elementary schools has been recommended by the Elementary Education Committee. The whole question will be taken into consideration.

Mazdoors for municipalities

* 2827 Q.—SRI K. P. GOPALAN: Will the Hon. the Minister for Health be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that the Kozhikode Municipality recommended to the Government in its budget for 1955-56 to sanction the appointment of 20 more sanitary mazdoors in the municipality; and

(b) if so, the action taken thereon?

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY: (a) No, Sir.

(b) The question does not arise.

* 2828 Q.—SRI K. P. GOPALAN: Will the Hon. the Minister for Health be pleased to state the reasons for the Government to refuse to grant house rent allowance to anti-malaria mazdoors in Tellicherry Municipality in Malabar?

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY: The Government have not refused any request of the Tellicherry Municipal Council for granting house rent allowance to the anti-malaria mazdoors in the municipality.

SRI V. R. KRISHNA AYYAR: May I know whether the Government really mean to say that no request was made for such an allowance or when the request was made it was disallowed by the Government?

THE HON. SRI A. B. SHETTY: The Government had no occasion to refuse such a proposal as it was not received by them.

Repairs to Kammalampoondi tank in Kancheepuram taluk

* 2829 Q.—SRI V. K. RAMASWAMY MUDALIAR: Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(a) whether the investigation of Kammalampoondi tank repair work in Kancheepuram taluk, Chingleput district, has been completed; and

(b) if not, the reasons for the delay?

THE HON. SRI R. SHANMUGA RAJESWARA SETHUPATHI: (a) Yes.

(b) Does not arise.

24th November 1955]

Grants to aided elementary schools

* 2830 Q.—SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP : Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state—

(a) whether any aided elementary schools in Malabar were not paid their grants for December 1954 and January 1955 until so late as February 12th, 1955; and

(b) if so, how many and for what reasons?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : (a) & (b) According to the programme for payment of teaching grant approved by Government, there will be no payments in the month of January. The final instalment of grant, i.e., grant for December, the balance of grant for November, along with the maintenance grant is payable in the second week of February only and the grant for January is payable in the third week of February. It is very likely that there may be cases in which grants are paid after the 12th February also.

Cauvery-Mettur Project area in Tanjore

* 2831 Q.—SRI S. SWAYAMPRAKASAM (on behalf of Sri P. Venkatesha Sholagar) : Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(a) the acreage included under temporary ayacut of Vadavar, Vennar division in Cauvery-Mettur Project area in Tanjore district; and

(b) whether the Government have taken any steps to bring them under permanent ayacut?

THE HON. SRI R. SHANMUGA RAJESWARA SETHUPATHI : (a) & (b) There is no such distinction as temporary and permanent ayacut in respect of the ayacut under Vadavar. The ayacut of 24,256 acres of Vadavar up to Moovarakottai regulator is the old permanent ayacut of that river included in the Cauvery Delta System. The ayacut below the regulator, comprising an extent of 35,893 acres is the ayacut of Vadavar Extension Canal and its branches, which comes under the Cauvery-Mettur Project. This is also treated as permanent ayacut under the Cauvery-Mettur Project.

Residential Basic Schools for Harijans

* 2832 Q.—SRI M. K. PADMAPRABHA GOUNDER : Will the Hon. the Minister for Religious Endowments and Transport be pleased to state—

(a) whether there is a proposal to open Residential Basic Schools for Harijans in the Wynaad taluk; and

(b) if so, when and how many?

[24th November 1955]

THE HON. SRI B. PARAMESWARAN : At present there is no proposal to open Residential Basic Schools for Harijans in the Wynaad taluk. But under the Grants-in-Aid schemes for the welfare of Scheduled Tribes, four Residential Basic Schools for Scheduled Tribes have been sanctioned in the Malabar district, out of which three are in the Wynaad taluk in Manantoddy, Sultan's Battery and Kalpetta. The schools have already been opened and are functioning satisfactorily.

MR. SPEAKER : Question Nos. 2833, 2834, 2835 and 2836 may be taken up together.

Full fee concession for students of Vanniyakula Kshatriya community

* 2833 Q.—SRI A. GOVINDASWAMY NAYAGAR : Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state—

(a) whether the children of the Vanniyakula Kshatriya community belonging to the districts of Tanjore, Tiruchirappalli, South Arcot and Salem are granted full fee concessions at all stages from 1954-55, if they happen to prosecute their studies outside the above said districts; and

(b) if not, why?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : (a) Yes, Sir, provided they can produce certificates to the effect that they belong to those districts and that their parents belonged to the former Criminal tribes. The others are given half-fee concessions.

(b) Does not arise.

Fee concessions to Vanniyakula Kshatriya community students

* 2834 Q.—SRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM : Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that school fee concessions are allowed at all stages of education to the children of Vanniyakula Kshatriya community of four districts alone;

(b) whether these orders on the above subject have already been given effect to; and

(c) if so, from which date?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : (a) Full fee concession in all stages of education is granted to the children of Vanniyakula Kshatriya of the districts of Tanjore, Tiruchirappalli, Salem and South Arcot who belong to the former Criminal tribes. The others are eligible for half fee concessions only.

(b) & (c) The orders have been given effect to from the school year 1954-55.

24th November 1955]

* 2835 Q.—SRI S. DAIVASIGAMONEY: Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state whether Vanniyakula Kshatriya students coming from the South Arcot district but studying in Madras and other districts in the State are eligible for the full fee concessions granted by the Government?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM: Yes, Sir, if the students can produce a certificate to the effect that their parents belonged to the former "Criminal tribes".

* 2836 Q.—SRI A. GOVINDASAMY NAYAGAR: Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have issued Memorandum No. 4699/D/52-6, Education, dated 21st May 1952, directing that those who are known as Vannia or Vannian or Vanniar or Padayachi or Gownder or Kander or Vannia Kander among the Vanniakula Kshatriya be granted the fee concession under Rule 92 of the Madras Educational Rules; and

(b) whether this name includes communities known by such names as Nayagars, Rayars, Katchi Rayars, etc.?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM: (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) No, Sir.

SRI K. VINAYAKAM: May I know whether the Government have in their possession any records to show which family is classified as a 'criminal tribe' in each village and in each district so that the students coming from those families may produce proper evidence?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM: I would like to have notice.

SRI A. GOVINDASAMY NAYAGAR: 1954-55-ல் தென்னாற்காடு ஜில்லா வன்னியகுல சனத்திரியர் சேர்க்கப்பட்டு ஓராண்டுக்குப் பிறகு மாஜி குற்றப்பரம்பரையினருக்கு மட்டும் என்று உத்தரவு போடப்பட்டது. இதற்கு முன்பே தஞ்சை, திருச்சி, சேலம் மாவட்டங்களில் இந்தக் கல்விச் சலுகை கொடுக்கப்பட்டது. அதுவும் குற்றப்பரம்பரை வன்னியருக்கு மட்டும் தானா?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM: குற்றப்பரம்பரையாக இருந்தால் முழுச் சம்பளச் சலுகை கொடுக்கப்படுகிறது, மற்றவர்களுக்கு பாதிச் சம்பளச் சலுகைதான்.

SRI R. V. SWAMINATHAN: May I know on what basis this full fee concession is given to the children of former Criminal Tribes belonging to Vanniyakula Kshatriya community? Is it given only on the criterion that they belong to the former Criminal Tribes? May I also know whether similar concessions are also given to the children of kallars and maravars living in Ramanathapuram district?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM: Yes, Sir. We have shown the same concession to all the former criminal tribes without any distinction.

[24th November 1955]

SRI K. ARANGANATHAN : In the Government Memorandum No. 4699/D/52-6, dated 21st May 1952, it has been said that those who are known as Vannian or Gownder or Padayachi are similar to Vanniakula Kshatriyas. They are not different communities but they belong to one and the same community. As such, may I request the Hon. Minister to revise the above memorandum and issue instructions that all these people belong to one and the same community and not to different communities?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : But those terms refer to other communities also. Take for example Gownders. There are other Gownders also. I am for example, not a Vanniakula Kshatriya. Therefore, I do not think there is any necessity to amend the Memorandum or the Government order.

SRI S. THINAKARASAMI THEVAR : May I know from the Hon. Minister whether the Government will show special preference to the most backward like Piramalai Kallars among the Backward Classes?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : We have got only three categories—the Scheduled Castes, Backward Classes and others. I do not think we can make any further distinction within the Backward Classes, as most backward, more backward and backward. I am afraid further compartmentalization is not possible.

SRI S. DAIVASIGAMONEY : In South Arcot District, Padayachis, Gownders and other sub-castes belonging to Vanniakula Kshatriyas were called Criminal Tribes in olden days. But now after the Constitution has come into force, we have no such tribes called Criminal Tribes. Will the Government, therefore, be pleased to grant the full fee concession to all persons who belong to these sub-castes of Vanniakula Kshatriya even though they are called Padayachis or Gownders or by any other nomenclature?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : The aim of the Government is to give full fee concessions to all communities whether they are Vanniakula Kshatriyas or non-Vanniakula Kshatriyas provided they are poor. We are aiming at that objective.

SRI M. PALANIYANDI : மதசார்பற்ற அரசாங்கம் என்று சொல்லிக் கொண்டிருக்கிற சர்க்கார் ஜாதி பாகுபாடு இன்றி இந்த நாட்டிலுள்ள எல்லா ஏழைமக்களின் குழந்தைகளுக்கும் இலவசமாகக் கல்வி அளிக்க வேண்டியதுதானே நியாயம் என்று நான் கேள்வி போட நினைத்தேன். அதுதான் சர்க்காரின் கொள்கை என நிதி மந்திரி அவர்கள் இதற்கு முந்திய கேள்வியில் விளக்கிவிட்டதால் மிக்க சந்தோஷத்தோடு அவரைப் பாராட்டுகிறேன். (சிரிப்பு.)

SRI A. GOVINDASAMY NAYAGAR : கனம் அங்கத்தினர் அரசாங்கநாதன் கேள்விக்கு பதில் அளிக்கையில் கல்வி மந்திரி அவர்கள் நானும் கவுண்டர். ஆனால் வன்னிய கவுண்டர் அல்ல என்றார். இப்படிச் சந்தேகத்திற்கு இடமில்லாமலிருக்கும் நாயகர், கச்சிரியர், அஞ்சாத சிங்கத்தார், மழுவராயர், புலிக்குத்தியார் போன்ற பட்டப் பெயர்கள் உள்ளவரும் வன்னியகுலக் கூடித்திரிய சமூகத்தை சேர்ந்தவர்கள் என்று விஸ்ட்டில் சேர்த்துக்கொள்ளப்படுமா?

24th November 1955]

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : முழுச் சீர்திருத்தவாதியாக விளங்கும் ஸ்ரீ கோவிந்தசாமி அவர்கள், அந்தச் சமூகத்தார் இப்படி கோடிப் பெயர்களை வைத்துக்கொள்வதற்குப் பதிலாக ஒரே பெயரை வைத்துக்கொள்வதற்கு ஒரு இயக்கத்தை ஆரம்பிப்பார்கள் என்று நம்புகிறேன்.

SRI T. SHANMUGAM : வன்னியகுலக் கூத்திரியர்கள் என்று தங்களைச் சொல்லிக் கொள்வதினால் அந்தச் சமூகத்தார் கூத்திரிய குலத்தைச் சேர்ந்தவர்கள். பிராமண, கூத்திரிய, வைச்ய, சூத்திர என்ற முறைப்படி அந்தக்காலத்தில் ஜாதிகள் பிரிக்கப்பட்டிருக்கிறது எனத் தெரியும். அந்த வரிசையில் பிராமணர்களுக்கு அடுத்தபடியாக கூத்திரியர்கள் வருகிறார்கள். பிராமணர்களுக்குப் பக்கத்தில் வருகிற அவர்களை ஏன் பிராமணர்களைப் போலவே உயர்ந்த வகுப்பார்களாகக் கருதக்கூடாது என்று கேட்கிறேன்.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : உண்மையாகவே இது ஆழ்ந்து யோசிக்கவேண்டிய விஷயம். நான் இவ்விஷயத்தைப் பரிசீலிக்கும்போது ஸ்ரீ ஷண்முகம் அவர்களையும் கலந்துகொண்டு பரிசீலனை செய்கிறேன்.

SRI S. DAIVASIGAMONEY : அந்த ஜாதிப் பாகுபாட்டை ஸ்ரீ ஷண்முகம் அவர்கள் நம்புகிறார்களா என்று கேட்கிறேன். (சிரிப்பு.)

MR. SPEAKER : With the leave of the House, the question time will be extended by five minutes.

SRI V. R. KRISHNA AYYAR : In reply to the question put by hon. Member Sri R. V. Swaminathan, the Hon. Minister was pleased to state that the concessions were extended to all criminal tribes. May I know the point of putting the accent upon the word 'all'?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : All is all and nobody is excluded. That is the only accent.

SRI K. R. VISWANATHAN : I had pointed out previously the difficulties in obtaining nativity certificates by the members of the former Criminal Tribes. About this, I had also submitted a memorandum to the Government. May I know what action has been taken by the Government to remove all these difficulties in obtaining nativity certificates?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : We are trying to remove all difficulties with reference to obtaining of certificates. But with reference to the particular memorandum submitted by the hon. Member and the action taken by the Government on it, I would like to have notice.

SRI M. R. RAMACHANDRAN : May I know from the Government whether it is not necessary that all the members of Vanniakula Kshatriya community as a whole irrespective of the fact whether they belong to the Criminal Tribes or not should be given preference with regard to education?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : I do not think I can recognize and the Government can recognize that Vanniakula Kshatriyas alone are entitled to preferential treatment. They have to go along with other Backward Classes and take their chances along with them.

[24th November 1955]

SRI R. V. SWAMINATHAN : Among the three categories of classification—Scheduled Castes, Backward Classes and others—members of Scheduled Castes are given various kinds of preferences. Though members of the Backward Classes deserve these preferences, they are not given. At least in the matter of granting full fee concession, will the Hon. Minister be pleased to grant it to all members of Backward Classes instead of granting it to this or that sect of Vanniakula Kshatriya community and former members of Criminal Tribes as even in the Cabinet there are two Ministers belonging to Vanniakula Kshatriya community?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : What further facilities should be made available to the various Backward Classes are under consideration of the Government. The recommendations of the Backward Classes Commission will be considered in this respect and decisions will be taken very soon.

SRI S. JAYARAMA REDDIAR : மதுரை, ராமநாதபுரம் ஜில்லாவில் குற்றபரம்பரையினர் என்பவர்கள் முன்பு இருந்தார்கள். அவர்களை குற்றபரம்பரையிலிருந்தே நீக்கிவிடவேண்டுமென்று ஒரு இயக்கம் ஆரம்பிக்கப்பட்டு, அவர்கள் குற்றபரம்பரையிலிருந்து நீக்கப்பட்டிருக்கிறார்கள். இப்பொழுது குற்றபரம்பரையினர் என்று பிரஸ்தாபிக்கப்படுவதினால் எழும் பிரச்சனை என்ன? தென்னாற்காடு ஜில்லாவில் இன்னமும் குற்றபரம்பரையினர் என்பவர்கள் இருக்கிறார்களா என்று தெரிந்து கொள்ளவும் விரும்புகிறேன்.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : இந்த லிஸ்டிலும் எக்ஸ் க்ருமினல் டிரைப்ஸ் என்றுதான் குறிப்பிட்டிருக்கிறோம். ஆனால் குற்றபரம்பரையினருக்குச் சலுகை கிடைக்கும் என்பதால் இன்றையதினம் குற்றபரம்பரையினராகக் கருதப்படாதவர்கள்கூட தங்களை குற்றபரம்பரையினர் என்று சொல்லிக்கொள்ளத்தான் செய்வார்கள். அது இயற்கை.

DR. (SRIMATHI) T. S. SOUNDARAM RAMACHANDRAN : இப்பொழுது உண்மையிலேயே மிகவும் பிற்போக்காக இருக்கின்ற சலவைக் காரர்கள், நாவிதர்கள், குலாலர்கள் . . . (Interruption.) நான் பாப்பாத்தி இல்லையே. என்னைச் சண்டாளி என்று அல்லவா சொல்லுகிறார்கள். என்னைப்போல இன்றைக்கும் எல்லோரும் “out of caste marriage” செய்துகொண்டுவிட்டார்கள் என்றால் நாட்டிலே சாதிச் சண்டையே ஏழாது. ஆனால் இன்றைக்கு உண்மையிலேயே மிகவும் பிற்போக்காக இருக்கின்ற சமூகத்தாருக்கு நாம் மிகவும் உதவி செய்யக் கட்டமைப்பட்டிருக்கிறோம். பிற்பட்டவர்கள் என்று சொல்லிக்கொண்டு இன்று பல மேற்பட்ட வகுப்பார்கள்கூட அதிகச் சலுகையைப் பெற்றுவருகிறார்கள். ஆனால் இந்தச் சமூகத்தார் மிகவும் பிற்போக்கான நிலைமையில் இருப்பதால் தனிப்பட்ட விதி எதுவும் வரையறுக்க முடியாது என்றாலும், “அன்டர்ஸ்டூட்” என்று சொல்லுவார்களே அந்த முறையில் இவர்களுக்கு அதிகச் சலுகையை அளிக்க சர்க்கார் முன்வருமா?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : That matter is under the active consideration of the Government.

Closure of a pathway in Thachanallur

* 2837 Q.—**SRI R. S. ARUMUGAM :** Will the Hon. the Minister for Local Administration be pleased to state—

(a) whether any representation was received from the public of Thachanallur, Tirunelveli taluk by the Government in 1954

24th November 1955]

regarding the inconvenience caused to them on account of the closure of the pathway leading from Velajapettai street, Thachanallur, Tirunelveli taluk, to Seeniappan Thiruthu tank; and

(b) if so, the action taken thereon?

THE HON. SRI S. S. RAMASAMY PADAYACHI: (a) Yes-Sir, through the President of Thachanallur panchayat in June 1954.

(b) The matter was examined in detail by the Government and the President, Tirunelveli District Board, has been requested to apply to the Collector of Tirunelveli for arranging for the early acquisition of lands for the pathway after passing necessary resolution in this regard.

MR. SPEAKER: Question time is over. I want to know from the Hon. the Leader of the House whether he is prepared to answer the Short Notice question given notice of by the hon. Member Sri K. C. Gopalan Unni about the alleged lathi charge in Kollengode. 10-10 a.m.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM: Sir, he gave me notice of the question only yesterday. Even with the best of my efforts, I could not get any information. So the hon. Member will have to wait till I get information from the authorities concerned.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member Sri K. P. Gopalan has given notice of an adjournment motion in regard to the very same matter. I do not think it is a matter of urgency or of public importance and it is therefore disallowed.

The next item on the Agenda is "Government Bills".

[Note.—An asterisk (*) at the commencement of a speech indicates revision by the Member.]

II.—GOVERNMENT BILL.

THE MADRAS PRESERVATION OF PRIVATE FORESTS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1955.

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU: Sir, I beg to introduce the Madras Preservation of Private Forests (Amendment) Bill *, 1955, and move:

"That the Bill be taken into consideration."

The Government had proposed to amend the Madras Forest Act, 1882, suitably so as to incorporate the provisions of this Act in that. But when we were preparing the Bill, certain legal difficulties cropped up and we could not incorporate these provisions in that Act. As the Madras Preservation of Private Forest Act expires in a week, there is necessity to extend the life of this Act. While doing that, we also take the opportunity of amending other provisions so that the Act could be enforced pro-

* Published in the Fort St. George Gazette Extraordinary, dated 19th November 1955.

[Sri M. A. Manickavelu] [24th November 1955]

perly and with that object in view, one or two amendments are proposed in this Bill. This is a small Bill and I hope the House will pass it without much discussion.

Mr. SPEAKER: Motion moved—

“That the Madras Preservation of Private Forests (Amendment) Bill, 1955, be taken into consideration.”

SRI A. RATNAM: Sir, I beg to move—

“That the Madras Preservation of Private Forests (Amendment) Bill, 1955, be referred to a Select Committee.”

SRI S. RAMALINGAM: Sir, I second it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Amendment moved—

“That the Madras Preservation of Private Forests (Amendment) Bill, 1955, be referred to a Select Committee.”

The motion and the amendment are before the House for discussion.

SRI A. RATNAM: கனம் சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே, இந்த குறிப்பிட்ட மசோதாவுக்கு இன்னும் ஒரு வார கால தவணைதான் இருக்கிறது. இந்த நேரத்தில் கனம் அமைச்சர் அவர்கள் அம்மசோதாவின் ஷரத்துக்களை திருத்த வருவார்களானால், இந்த மசோதாவை உடனடியாக நிறைவேற்ற வேண்டியதுதான். ஆனால் சர்க்காரின் சார்பாக, கனம் அமைச்சர் அவர்கள், Statement of Objects and Reasons என்ற பகுதியில் என்ன சொல்லுகிறார் என்றால், இது மிக அவசியமானது, இதிலே பல குறைகள் இருக்கின்றன. சட்டம் அமுல் செய்வதில் உத்யோகஸ்தர்களுக்கு பல கஷ்டங்கள் இருக்கின்றன. ஆகவே இதை எல்லாம் பரிசீலனைசெய்து நிரந்தரமான ஒரு மசோதாவைக் கொண்டுவந்து நிறைவேற்ற வேண்டும், அதற்காக, துரிதமான காரியங்களை எல்லாம் சர்க்கார் காரியாலயத்தில் அதிகாரிகள் செய்துவருகிறார்கள், என்று சொல்லுகிறார்கள். இவ்விதம் சொல்லும்போது இந்த மசோதாவை இரண்டு வருஷ தவணைக்கு நீடிக்க திருத்தங்கள் தேவையா என்று கேட்கிறேன். இன்னொரு யோசனையை அமைச்சர் அவர்கள் கூறுகிறபோது, இது மிக முக்கியமான திருத்த அம்சம், சட்டத்திற்கு பல திருத்தங்கள் செய்யவேண்டியதாக இருக்கிறது, அதற்காக, அவைகளைப் பூர்த்திசெய்ய, இரண்டு வருஷகால தவணை அதிகாரிகளுக்கு வேண்டியதாக இருக்கிறதென்று சொன்னால், சர்க்கார் அதிகாரிகள் முக்கியமான காரியங்களைச் செய்ய, அவசியமான சட்டங்களைச் செய்யவும், எவ்வளவு உதாசீன எண்ணத்துடன் இருக்கிறார்கள் என்பதை நாம் பார்க்கிறோம். ஆகவே இந்த மசோதாவை இரண்டு வருஷங்களுக்கு ஒத்திப்போடக்கூடாது, ஒரு வருஷ தவணை நீடித்தால் போதுமென்று, திருத்தம் கொண்டு வந்திருக்கிறேன்.

அதுமட்டுமல்ல, இந்த மசோதாவில் வேறொரு முக்கியமான விஷயத்தையும் அமைச்சர் அவர்கள் கூறுகிறார்கள். நல்லமுறையில் குறையிலலாத சட்டம் கூடியவரையில் கொண்டுவர இருக்கும்போது, இந்த திருத்தம் தற்போது அவசியமா என்பதுதான் கேள்வி. இந்த திருத்தமானது போலீஸ் அதிகாரிகளின், காட்டிலாகா அதிகாரிகளின் அதிகாரங்களை பொருத்தது. இந்த மசோதாவின் காலம், டிசம்பர் இரண்டாம் தேதியுடன் முடிவு அடைகிறது. பிரித்தியேக் மசோதா வரும் வரையில், இந்த மசோதாவையே இரண்டு வருஷ காலத்திற்கு நீடிக்க வேண்டுமென்று அமைச்சர் அவர்கள் கேட்கிறார்கள். அதற்கே நான் ஒரு

24th November 1955] [Sri A. Ratnam]

வருஷ நீடிப்பு போதுமென்று திருத்தம் கொண்டுவந்திருக்கிறேன். அந்த கால நீடிப்பு மட்டுமல்லாமல், அதிகாரிகளுடைய அதிகார விஷயமாகவும் திருத்தம் கொண்டுவந்திருக்கிறார்கள். சாதாரணமாக இவ்வதிகாரங்கள் விஷயமாக, பிரத்தியேக மசோதா சட்டசபை முன்வரும்போது, அங்கத்தினர் விவாதித்து முடிவு செய்யவேண்டியதாகும். அதை விட்டு, ஒரு திருத்தம் கொண்டுவந்து அவ்வதிகாரிகளுக்கு அதிகாரங்கள் பெறலாமென்று அமைச்சர் அவர்கள் நினைக்கிறார்கள். அது கூடாதென்பதற்காகத்தான் இந்த திருத்தத்தை பொருக்குக் கமிட்டிக்கு விடவேண்டுமென்று கேட்டிருக்கிறேன்.

பிரஜைகள், இந்த திருத்தங்களால் எப்படி பாதிக்கப்படுவார்கள் என்பதைப்பற்றி சற்று யோசிக்கவேண்டும். இத்திருத்தங்கள் சாதாரணமான திருத்தங்கள் அல்ல. இத்திருத்தங்கள் இப்போது நிறைவேற்றப்பட்டு புத்தப்பட்டால் போலீஸ் அதிகாரிகளுக்கும், காட்டிலாகா அதிகாரிகளுக்கும் யார்மீது வேண்டுமானாலும் குற்றத்தைச் சாட்டி, குற்றப் பத்திரிகை சமர்ப்பித்து தண்டிக்கும்படியான நிலைமை ஏற்படும். இன்றைக்கு இதனால் சட்ட வரம்பையும் மீறி, நிரபராதிகளின்மேல் குற்றம் சாட்டி சிறை தண்டனை தூக்கு தண்டனைகூட கொடுக்கலாம். இப்படியாக, குற்றமற்றவர்களையும், நிராயுதபாணிகளையும் குற்றவாளிகளாக மாஜிஸ்ட்ரேட் முன் நிறுத்தி, தீர்ப்புக் கொடுத்து தண்டிக்கும் முறையில்தான் இந்த மசோதா அமையும். ஆகவேதான் இந்த அமைச்சர் கொண்டுவந்த முக்கிய திருத்தத்தை பொருக்குக் கமிட்டிக்கு பரிசீலனைக்கு விடுமாறு கேட்டுக்கொள்ளுகிறேன். மற்றும், அதிகாரிகள் பிரத்தியேக மசோதா தயாரிப்பதற்காக இந்த மசோதாவின் காலத்தை இரண்டு வருஷத்திற்கு நீடித்தால் மேலும் மேலும் அதிகாரிகள், மசோதா தயாரிப்பதில் இடையூறுகளும், தகராறுகளும் கொண்டுவந்து காலத்தை நீடித்துக் கொண்டேபோவார்கள். அவர்களை துரத்தப்படுத்தத்தான், ஒரு வருஷ கால தவணை இப்போதிருக்கும் மசோதாவுக்கு போதுமென்று சொல்லுகிறேன். மறுபடியும் சொல்லுகிறேன் போலீஸ், காட்டிலாகா அதிகாரிகளுக்கு அதிகாரங்கள் கொடுக்கும் விஷயமான திருத்தத்தை பொருக்குக் கமிட்டி யோசித்து முடிவு செய்த பிறகு சபையின்முன் கொண்டுவந்து நிறைவேற்றினால் நல்லாய் இருக்கும். இல்லாவிட்டால் இவ்வதிகாரிகளினால் பொதுஜனங்கள் மிகக் கஷ்டப்படுவார்கள். ஏற்கனவே இந்த காட்டிலாகா அதிகாரிகள் காட்டு தர்பார்தான் செய்துகொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள். ஆகவே என் திருத்தங்களை ஏற்று இரண்டு வருஷ கால தவணையை ஒரு வருஷ மாகியும் போலீஸ், காட்டிலாகா அதிகாரிகளுக்கு அதிகாரங்கள் வழங்கும் பிரேரேபணையை பொருக்குக் கமிட்டியின் ஆலோசனைக்கு விடும்படி கனம் அமைச்சர் அவர்களைக் கேட்டுக்கொள்ளுகிறேன்.

* SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP: Sir, much of the valuable 10-20
time of the House is being taken away by Bills providing for a.m.
extending the life of the existing Acts. Every time a Bill is brought forward, its duration is restricted to one or two years and a promise that a comprehensive Bill will be brought forward before the expiry of the life of that Act is made. The Madras Preservation of Private Forests Act was enacted in 1949. If the extension of the life of that Act now sought is the only solitary instance, we can excuse it. But extension is sought not once or twice but *ad infinitum*. In future, I think, it will be better if the Government provide in the Bill only the date of the commencement of the operation of the Act and not say anything about its duration. In the comprehensive Bill, as and when it comes, provision can be made for repealing the temporary Act. I request the Government to give up the present timid policy, because it is not a good policy. I do not know the object behind

[Sri M. Narayana Kurup] [24th November 1955]

such a policy. Probably the Government want the people to be kept informed that a comprehensive legislation will be brought forward. If, for unavoidable reasons, it becomes necessary to extend the life of an Act, it can be extended once or twice but not several times as in the case of the Act in question.

* SRI K. C. GOPALAN UNNI : Sir, it requires extraordinary courage on the part of the Minister to come before this Assembly now and then for the extension of the life of an Act. For the last four years, Members of this Assembly have been demanding that the Government should bring forward a comprehensive legislation for the preservation of the forest wealth of this State. Every time the approval of this House for the extension of the life of the Madras Preservation of Private Forests Act is sought, the Minister used to say that a comprehensive legislation was almost ready and would be coming up before the Legislature.

Has the Madras Preservation of Private Forests Act been working successfully? My experience is that its provisions are being violated with the connivance of the District Forest Officer, the Assistant Conservator of Forests at Coimbatore especially and the Collector of Malabar. The Government do not take any action at all against the offenders. Cutting of trees over a small extent of forest area by small cultivators for cultivating the land is not allowed, while people who cut down trees on hundreds of acres of forest area are allowed to do so even without the force of an enquiry. That is why we want a comprehensive legislation for the preservation of forests. Is it because a comprehensive legislation will restrict the right of certain janmies of Malabar that the Government are afraid of bringing it forward? When the question of land reforms was raised in this House about two days back, the Hon. Minister said that promises were made due to pressure from the public. Is that the position in this case also?

The Madras Preservation of Private Forests Act is applicable mostly to Malabar. As the partition of the State is impending, Government do not want to bring forward a comprehensive legislation, but want to extend the life of the existing Act for two years. Whether the forests are in Tamilnad or in Kerala, we must see that they are preserved. Always some excuse or other is given by the Government to escape the responsibility of bringing forward a comprehensive legislation. I hope the Government will bring in the legislation soon.

In the Statement of Objects and Reasons appended to the Bill, it is stated : " It is unlikely that the Madras Forest (Amendment) Bill, 1955, for amending the Madras Forest Act, 1882, which, among other things, embodies the essential provisions of the 1949 Act would be passed into law before that date." I think that Bill has not even been published so far. Then it is stated : " It has also been suggested to the Government that the provisions relating to private forests embodied therein are not suitable and not adequate to meet the requirements and that separate legislation in respect

24th November 1955] [Sri K. C. Gopalan Unni]

of private forests should be undertaken." Who made this suggestion to the Government? Let the Government introduce the Bill, refer it to a Select Committee, take expert opinion and then come to a decision.

Two new penal provisions are added by clauses 3 and 4 of the Amending Bill. I am afraid the power conferred by these provisions will be used for harassing *bona fide* cultivators. I appeal to the Government not to press for the retention of these clauses, pending the enactment of a comprehensive legislation.

* SRI K. PARTHASARATHY: Sir, I support the motion moved by the Hon. Minister. I regret I have to repeat what I represented on the floor of this House on two occasions. The provisions of the Madras Preservation of Private Forests Act as they are now are not conducive to the interests of agriculturists. The Act as it now stands permits the removal of green manure from the forest only in headloads and prohibits its removal in cart-loads except with the previous permission of the Collector or some other officer. I have repeatedly represented to the Government to permit the removal of green manure by cart-loads without the permission of any officer. An agriculturist cannot go about seeking permission, as he has got to look after cultivation. He will require about three hundred headloads of green manure for manuring one acre of land. If his land is situated at a distance of four or five miles from the forest area, we can imagine to how much difficulty he will be put in carrying three hundred headloads of green manure over a distance of four or five miles. Considering the difficulties of agriculturists, I hope the Hon. Minister will permit the removal of green manure by cart-loads for *bona fide* agricultural purposes without the permission of any officer, by making suitable provision in the rules or by amending the Act.

SRI V. R. KRISHNA AYYAR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have nothing new to contribute to the discussion except to complain that even when the entire House is behind the Hon. Minister in this matter, even when the Hon. Minister has repeated times without number that a comprehensive Bill is in the offing and is ready for introduction and in spite of the fact that in the Five-Year Plan it was pompously mentioned that the aim of the Government was to acquire all private forests so that they might be preserved as national wealth—in spite of all these propitious circumstances attending upon this matter—it is certainly tragic to note that the Government have simply come forward with the usual habit—the customary habit, the chronic habit, as it were—of just having the life of the Act extended by another couple of years. There are only two explanations possible for this conduct of the Government. Of course, I am just guessing and I would be happy to have a contradiction from the Hon. Minister on these points. One is that of late the Government of Madras are rather allergic to questions of Malabar. There is absolutely no doubt that this is a Bill which primarily affects Malabar and now that it is pretty clear that

are
tlt-

10-30
a.m.

[24th November 1955]

[illegible]

24th November 1955] [Sri O Koran]

നതിനും അഭിവൃദ്ധിപ്പെടുത്തുന്നതിനും ഉതകുന്ന ഒരു നിയമം ഗവണ്മെന്റ് അടിയന്തരമായി കൊണ്ടുവരണമെന്നഭ്യർത്ഥിക്കുകയും എന്റെ പ്രസംഗം അവസാനിപ്പിക്കുകയും ചെയ്യുന്നു.

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU : Sir, I oppose the motion for reference of this Bill to a Select Committee because, as it was pointed out, the object is very simple, namely, to extend the life of this Act by two years under the circumstances already stated. I shall briefly state it again because the hon. Members had some misapprehensions and were making remarks which were not called for. When I last moved for extension of the life of this Act, I really thought that I would not stand up again for asking for its extension because the intention was to incorporate the provisions of the Preservation of Private Forests Act in the Forest Act. So, I told my Hon. Colleague in charge of Forests that I would ease to sponsor this Bill and that it would be his job to take care of the comprehensive Bill. Things were moving on that understanding. But controversy arose over incorporating the provisions in the Forest Act. There was correspondence between this Government and the Centre. Many legal difficulties were pointed out and these provisions could not be incorporated in that Act. That is the only reason. Now, I am asking with the best of intentions for its extension because I want to hand over the forests in a good condition to the prospective Kerala State. I do not want to give them the forests in a denuded condition. That is why in spite of the criticism that may be levelled against it, I have come forward to ask for extension and I ask for extension for two years this time and not for one year. There is a reason behind that also. We have been discussing the Report of the States Reorganization Commission for the last three days. People are absorbed in their attention as to how best to reorganize the States. When a new State is formed, it will be faced with many problems and we should not burden them with another problem. That is why we are giving ample time for them to consider the question so that they may shape this legislation in their best interests. Now, whatever I may do, the hon. Members coming from that area will still be making allegations. Already one hon. Member has said that we are allergic to Malabar, still they will say that this or that was not done and that this or that was done with a view to help the janmis or so on. So, it is best that they shape their own legislation. They will have enough time to do that. That is why this two-year period has been asked for.

Now, Sir, the hon. Member from Tellicherry always has a knack of insinuating. He is an adept at that. He said that because these forests were in Malabar, we were not taking interest in them. Even, with regard to acquiring these forests, we have taken steps to see how much we should pay by way of compensation and other connected matters. It will show the interest with which we are dealing with this subject.

[Sri M. A. Manickavelu] [24th November 1955]

10-40 a.m. Then, I have already stated that the question of helping the jenmis does not at all arise; to the hon. Member from Tellicherry the jenmis seem as a red-rag. I do not know why.

Sir, the hon. Member who moved the main amendment asked why I instead of restricting to one or two amendments, bring so many amendments. Well, Sir, if we carefully look into it, we will find that there is merely one extra amendment. One amendment is about extension. Another amendment is for authorizing officers and others to take proper action to control the illicit felling of trees. The other amendments are only consequential. So, he need not be carried away or scared by the number.

Coming to the hon. member Sri Parthasarathy, Sir, he referred to the difficulties of taking the lease for manure and other things. I may state, Sir, these private forests are all mostly in Malabar only in our State. I do not think there are any private forests worth mentioning in the prospective residuary State. Therefore, all these difficulties will arise under the Forests Act and not under the Madras Preservation of Private Forests Act. When the other Bill is taken into consideration, these difficulties may be met. But, as far as this Bill is concerned, these difficulties do not very much come in. I submit therefore that there is no use referring the Bill to a Select Committee. I request that the House will be pleased to pass this motion.

* SRI K. PARTHASARATHY : Sir, the Hon. Minister stated that private forests are only in Malabar and nowhere else. I may say for the information of the Hon. Minister that there are three jagirs in Kallakurichi taluk itself, that is, in my own constituency and there are extensive forests which have been brought under the Madras Preservation of Private Forests Act. I know, Sir, that ryots have been experiencing much difficulty; they are being harassed by Government officers. That is why I have been pressing that suitable amendments can be made in the rules. I have been repeating this and this is the third time.

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU : What is Kallakurichi forest when compared to the Malabar forests? It is like an ant and an elephant.

MR. SPEAKER : Is the hon. Member Sri Ratnam pressing his amendment?

SRI A. RATNAM : I am pressing, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER : I am putting the amendment to the vote of the House. The question is—

“ That the Madras Preservation of Private Forests (Amendment) Bill, 1955, be referred to a Select Committee.”

The amendment was put and lost.

24th November 1955]

MR. SPEAKER : The question is—

“ That the Madras Preservation of Private Forests (Amendment) Bill, 1955, be taken into consideration.”

The motion was put and carried.

Clause 2.

MR. SPEAKER : The motion is—

“ That clause 2 do stand part of the Bill.”

The hon. Member Mr. Ratnam may now move his amendment.

SRI A. RATNAM : Sir, I move the following amendment :—

“ For the words and figures ‘ 2nd December 1957 ’ occurring in line 15 of page 1, *substitute* the words and figures ‘ 2nd December 1956 ’.”

SRI S. RAMALINGAM : I second it.

SRI T. C. NARAYANAN NAMBIAR : Mr. Speaker, Sir, no doubt, it has become a reality that we are going to separate. I believe that the Hon. Minister will excuse me when I say that the administration of the Preservation of Private Forests Act was not at all done in a proper way. Denudation of forests has taken place to such a large extent that it has become almost a national calamity as far as Malabar is concerned. So, at this stage, I would request the Government at least to see that the provisions of the Act are strictly enforced and strict instructions given to the officers concerned.

MR. SPEAKER : The hon. Member should confine his speech to the amendment in question. It is not a general discussion.

SRI T. C. NARAYANAN NAMBIAR : Sir, I am not agreeing to the amendment. (Laughter.) I have no objection to extending it by two years, three years or even fifty years because we are confident that the Kerala State is going to come. We are also confident that we can have comprehensive legislation in this regard in the best interests of Kerala. But, till that time (because it is only two years), as long as Malabar is in this State, I would request the Government to see that indiscriminate felling of trees is strictly prohibited. Because, I know that so much humbug and “ Kumbakonam ” if I may use the word, are taking place.

SRI K. VINAYAKAM : What is the import of the word “ Kumbakonam ” Sir? Why should the hon. Member import a bad name into the word “ Kumbakonam ”?

SRI T. C. NARAYANAN NAMBIAR : Sir, “ Kumbakonam ” is in Tanjore district where the soil is very alluvial and also very fertile. So also, the region where the forests are abundant, the soil is . . .

MR. SPEAKER : I think the word “ Kumbakonam ” finds a place in the Oxford Dictionary, also.

[24th November 1955]

SRI S. RAMALINGAM : What is the meaning of the word as found in the Oxford Dictionary, Sir?

MR. SPEAKER : The hon. Member may refer to the Dictionary himself.

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU : The argument of the hon. Member who moved the motion has been ably met by the hon. Member Sri T. C. Narayanan Nambiar. He wants to extend the life of the Act not only by two years or three years but even fifty years. But, anyway, Sir, I am only concerned with two years. The Government have been preserving the forests for them to the best of their ability and now they have also got the other amendment to make the preservation more effective. Now, under the Act, the officers can also take cognizance of any illicit felling, and seize illicit produce, tools, etc., involved in offences. Hon. Member will therefore see how very careful we are here to see that the forests are well preserved for them.

As regards " Kumbakonam " Sir, well, I do not know whether I have to deal with " Trivandrum " hereafter.

MR. SPEAKER : I shall now put the amendment of Mr. Ratnam to the vote of the House. The question is—

" For the words and figures ' 2nd December 1957 ' occurring in line 15 of page 1, substitute the words and figures ' 2nd December 1956 '."

The amendment was put and lost.

Clause 2 was put and carried.

Clause 3.

MR. SPEAKER : The question is—

" That clause 3 do stand part of the Bill."

The hon. Member Sri Ratnam will move his amendment.

SRI A. RATNAM : Sir, I move—

Omit the word ' punishable ' in line 4 of page 2.

10-50
a.m.

கனம் சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே, கனம் அமைச்சர் அவர்கள் இந்த மசோதாவின் மூலம், Madras Preservation of Private Forests Act, 1949-ன் ஆயுளை மேலும் இரண்டு ஆண்டுகள் நீடித்திருக்கிறார். " ஏதோ இந்த States Reorganization Commission ரிப்போர்ட்டு மூலமாக " பல காரியங்கள் நடக்கின்றன; அதனால்தான் இந்த சட்டத்தின் ஆயுளை இரண்டு ஆண்டு காலத்திற்கு நீடிக்க வேண்டியிருக்கிறது; அது மட்டுமல்ல, மலையாளமும், தமிழகமும் தனித்தனியாக பிரிந்த பிறகு பல சிக்கலான காரியங்களை கவனிக்கவேண்டியிருக்கும், அவைகளை பரிசீலனை செய்வதற்கு அவகாசம் வேண்டும். ஆகவே இந்த சட்டத்தின் ஆயுளை ஒரு ஆண்டு காலத்திற்கு நீடித்து, ராஜ்ய சீரமைப்பால் ஏற்படும் பிரச்சனைகளை கவனிக்க வேண்டிய சமயத்தில், காடுகள் சம்பந்தமான பிரச்சனைகளை மலையாள

24th November 1955] [Sri A. Ratnam]

தேசத்தவர்கள் கவனிக்கவேண்டிய தொந்தரவுகளை வைக்கவேண்டாம் என்றுதான் இரண்டு ஆண்டு காலத்திற்கு ஆயுளை நீடித்திருப்பதாக கூறினார்கள். இந்தவிதமான நொண்டிச் சாக்கை கூறுவதானது, S.R.C. report-ன் பேரில், நிரந்தரமான நியாயம் கிடைக்கவில்லையென்றால், அடுத்து வரும் பொதுத் தேர்தலையும் ஒத்திப்போட வேண்டுமென்ற நிர்ப்பந்தம் வரக்கூடும் என்ற கருத்தை அமைச்சர் அவர்கள் இந்த சட்ட சபையில் பிரதிபலிக்கும் தோரணையில் உள்ளது என்பதை குறிப்பிட ஆசைப்படுகிறேன். இந்த திருத்த சட்டத்தை பரிசீலனைக்கு எடுத்துக்கொள்ள வேண்டும் என்று கோரும்போது, அமைச்சர் அவர்கள் “நாங்கள் இந்த சட்டத்திலுள்ள பல விதிகளை திருத்தவேண்டுமென்று கூறியிருக்கிறோம், அந்த திருத்தங்கள் சம்பந்தப்பட்ட வரையில் விவாதம் செய்ய அவசியம் இல்லை, உடனடியாக விவாதமில்லாமல் சட்டமாக நிறைவேற்றிவிட வேண்டும்” என்று முத்தாக பேசினார். ஆனால் இந்த சட்டத்தின் மூன்றாவது பிரிவை (third clause) எடுத்துக்கொண்டு பார்க்கும்போது, குற்றம் புரியாதவர்களைக்கூட, இவர்கள் தனிப்பட்டவர்களின் காடுகளில் சென்று கொடுக்கல் செய்தார்கள் என்று குற்றம் சாட்டினாலும், இந்த சட்டத்தின் மூன்றாவது பிரிவுப்படி, “Forest offence means an offence punishable under this Act” என்று இருப்பதால் நியாயாதிபதிகள் அவர்களை கண்டிப்பாக தண்டிக்கவேண்டும் என்று மறைமுகமாக புகுத்தப் பட்டிருக்கிறது. இந்த ஒரு வார்த்தையை ஏன் புகுத்தவேண்டுமென்பதுதான் என்னுடைய கேள்வி. அதை ஏன் நீக்கக்கூடாது என்று கேட்க விரும்புகிறேன். இந்த சட்டத்தின் ஆயுட் காலத்தை நீடிக்கவேண்டுமென்று கொண்டுவந்திருக்கக்கூடிய மசோதாவில், இந்த மாதிரியான சில அபாயகரமான செய்துக்களை புகுத்துவது நியாயமாகாது, நேர்மையாகாது என்று சொல்லிக்கொள்ள ஆசைப்படுகிறேன். எனவே, இந்த வார்த்தையை எடுத்துவிடும் பட்சத்தில், எனக்கு இந்த மசோதாவின் பேரில் ஆட்சேபணை கிடையாது. அதை எடுத்துவிடவேண்டும் என்றுதான் நான் திருத்தத்தின் மூலமாக கோருகிறேன்.

The amendment was duly seconded.

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU : I am sorry the hon. Member moved the amendment without quite understanding what it is. Since all his amendments have been seconded by his hon. Friend Sri Vinayakam, who is having some study of law, I would only advise the hon. Mover of the amendment to take some lessons on “Law” from him.

MR. SPEAKER : I will now put the amendment to the vote of the House.

SRI A. RATNAM : In view of the explanation given by the Hon. Minister, I am withdrawing my amendment.

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

Clause 3 was put and carried.

Clause 4 was put and carried.

Clause 1 and the Preamble were put and carried.

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU : Sir, I move—

“That the Madras Preservation of Private Forests (Amendment) Bill, 1955, be passed.”

MR. SPEAKER : The question is—

“That the Madras Preservation of Private Forests (Amendment) Bill, 1955, be passed.”

The motion was put and carried and the Bill was passed.

[24th November 1955]

III.—REPORT OF THE STATES REORGANIZATION COMMISSION, 1955 (DISCUSSION)—*cont.*

MR. SPEAKER : I wish to say that it may be that some of the hon. Members who wanted to speak have not been able to participate in the discussion but I think in the main all the points which the hon. Members had to place before the House have been fully placed. On account of the shortness of time, it may be that we have not been able to extend the time longer or to allow all those hon. Members who wanted to participate in the discussion to speak. Now, I call Mr. Swayamprakasam to speak.

* SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP : Sir, I was one of those Members who were intended to be given an opportunity but I understand that to-day only leaders of Parties are allowed to speak. I have been a Member of the Assembly for 3½ years and to the best of my recollection my name has not been associated with the creation of a bad precedent. Now at the fag end of the life of the Assembly, I do not want to create any bad precedent, however, much I may regret the non-availability of the opportunity to speak on an occasion like this.

SRI S. SWAYAMPRAKASAM : Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Report of the States Reorganization Commission has been successful to the extent that it has created a sort of emotional unrest throughout the country. On the fourth day of the discussion of this Report on the floor of this House, we are able to see how it has been discussed and received by the people in other parts of the country. We see in newspapers that in Bombay the Legislature has been prorogued because of the disturbances of the people and the legislators were not in a position to continue the discussion. I can understand if the Legislature had been adjourned *sine die* but I do not understand what made the Bombay Legislature to be prorogued by the Governor of that State? Sir, we also read in the newspapers that yesterday in the Vindhya Pradesh, the people had gone to the extent of manhandling the Ministers not outside the House but inside it and shoes were also thrown at each other. Now, somebody behind me says that they were pre-arranged. It was a very unfortunate thing that the people there had indulged in such hooliganism. Is it not the duty of that Government to put it down? The wonderful part of it is that the State Legislature without transacting any business, has adjourned. Fortunately for us, such things are not happening in our part of the country. But I can say this, namely, that as a result of the recommendations of the States Reorganization Commission, the worst hit State is the Madras State. We the Members of the Assembly are now making speeches as if we are going to part with one another. Our Malayalee friends and our friends from South Kanara district speak as though they are going away permanently to a foreign country. (Interruption—No, no). It was painful to hear the disciples of Gandhiji referring to the unity of the country in the first portion of their speeches and then speaking in a vein in the latter portion

24th November 1955] [Sri S. Swayamprakasam]

of their speeches as if they were going away to a different part of the world and as if they had nothing to do with this part of the country. I appeal to those friends to realize that they are going to be our neighbours. Our wish and only appeal to them is that they should be our very good neighbours. When the Andhras were leaving, we said the same thing to them. It is not the wish of Tamilians here to send away the Andhras or the Malayalees or the Kannadigas. The Andhras wanted to have a separate territory for themselves. So also is the cry of Malayalees to have a separate Kerala State. We the Tamil people do not stand in their way. When they are parting from us, and whatever area they take away from us that area is going to be a neighbouring area for us the Tamilians. Therefore, let us try to be very good neighbours. That is the appeal I want to make to them.

So far as this State is concerned, we have got only certain border disputes. What is the principle that has got to be adopted in settling these border disputes? So far as the State of Travancore-Cochin is concerned, we want Devikulam and Peermede taluks. Our friend, Sri Kuttikrishnan Nayar, wants to take the district as a unit. When we analyse the statistics having district as a unit we find that the Tamilians are nowhere. Our Communist Friends want the village to be taken as a unit. We want that the taluk should be taken as a unit. The Hon. Leader of the House has stated—and even the authors of the S.R.C. Report have stated—that if taluk-war statistics are taken into account, the Tamilians are in a majority in both the Devikulam and Peermede taluks. When 70 per cent of the population in both the taluks are Tamilians, naturally they must go to the Tamil State. In this connexion the only point to be considered is what safeguards must be provided for the protection of the minorities in those areas. That is the only point that must be discussed here. When we first admit that the States have got to be divided according to language and then we also come to a conclusion on the basis on which a particular part of the country is to be divided—the Dhar Committee has already settled the point that the population of Tamilians in these two taluks is 70 per cent—the only other point that has to be considered is how best we can safeguard the interests of the minority population. Discussion on any other subject is beside the point.

Another important point has been put forward. This relates to irrigation sources and to what is to happen to them if the area where they are situated is transferred to another State. The S.R.C. itself has answered that point. The Parliament also are going to pass necessary legislation in respect of this matter. If there are any water sources in Peermede and Devikulam taluks and if the T.C. State Government are utilizing that water and if they have got also proposals for utilization of water to a greater extent, the only question is that Tamilnad should not stand in the way of their using it. There can be no difficulty for their utilizing the water.

[Sri S. Swayamprakasam] [24th November 1955]

Now I come to the question of Gudalur taluk. It is said that certain villages in that taluk are predominantly populated by Malayalees. This morning also, certain friends put a number of supplementary questions on that subject. I have received three or four telegrams from the people of that taluk. I have not myself visited Gudalur taluk, in the last three or four days. One telegram reads: "Chettis and Hill Tribes, Gudalur taluk, S.R.C. Report welcomed. Do not believe in Aikya Kerala Deputations." A similar telegram has also been received from the Congress Committee, Gudalur. That is the wish of the people of Gudalur taluk. The Hon. the Leader of the House has already stated that if the population figures are analysed the majority of the people will be Tamilians and that Malayalees cannot have a case to retain Gudalur in Kerala.

Some Members have spoken about Palghat taluk, and have stated that that portion will have to go to the Tamil area. I have been to Palghat taluk. I believe a large number of Tamil people have gone and settled there. I have seen in the papers very many people saying that Malabar district should not be integrated with T.C. State. If that be the case, the Malayalees may not grudge to give Palghat taluk to Tamilnad.

As regards other border areas, many hon. Members have spoken and I do not want to refer to them now. I want to refer to one other important matter and that is about the safeguards to be provided for the minorities. Certain memoranda had been presented to the States Reorganization Commission giving out a suggestion that a Statutory Judicial Commission has to be appointed for the purpose of safeguarding the interests of linguistic minorities in various places. But the Commission have said that there need not be any Statutory Commission and that it can be entrusted to the Governors of the various States. That is one of the recommendations of the S.R.C. Report that Governors may be empowered to look after the interests of the linguistic minorities in the various States. I beg to differ from this view. It may not be a good thing to entrust the task of safeguarding the interests of the minorities to the Governors. Nowadays, from experience, we find that Governors are not rising above party politics. Secondly, they are under the direct control of the Centre. They may not be in a position to properly look after the interests of the minorities. So my point is that the task of looking after the welfare of the minorities must rest with a Statutory Commission.

Another important recommendation of the Commission is about the appointment of Members of Public Service Commissions serving only single States. The Commission have said that as so many States are grouped together, appointments to the Public Service Commission may be made by the President and that this principle might be followed with regard to the appointments of Public Service Commission Members by the States also. I am afraid this is not a good principle. So far as the State Public Service Commission is concerned, the power of appointment must be left to the States themselves. After all, the President may not choose the right person. This is one point I wish to stress.

24th November 1955] [Sri S. Swayamprakasam]

The next question is with regard to the name to be adopted for the Madras State. I have given notice of an amendment that it should be called "Tamil Nad" after the separation of Malabar and South Kanara districts. So far as I am concerned, I could see no objection to this. But certain rumours are afloat that this is not the proper time to change the name. I ask, why? As pointed out by my friend Sri K. Vinayakam, Madras is a foreign name and there is no historical background for that name. As has been pointed out by the hon. Member Sri A. Gajapathy Nayar in the other House, it is meaningless to retain the name "Madras State", as "*mad ras*" leads us nowhere. Certain people advance the plea that the name "Madras" is very well-known and therefore, why it should be called "Tamil Nad". I have no objection to have Madras as the capital after changing the name of the Madras State into "Tamil Nad". My point is this. Tamil has been recognized as one of the fourteen national languages in the Constitution. The name "Tamil" is not well known in North India and the outside world. If we name our State as "Tamil Nad", then it will be known to the outside world and everybody will know that there is a language known as Tamil and there is also a State which is named after our language. Only for that purpose I want the name to be changed immediately, without postponing it to a future date. Our State should be named after our language, Tamil and this is the proper occasion for that.

I thank you, Sir, for the opportunity given to me to speak.

* SRI K. UPPI : Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, the question before the House is a matter over which feelings have run high in some places. But in this House very little passion has been exhibited. From the trend of the discussion, it would appear as if the question before the House is separation of Malabar from Madras and formation of a Kerala State and what portion of Malabar shall form part of the proposed Kerala State, I mean whether the whole area in which Malayalam is the main language or only a portion of it shall form the future Kerala State. This seems to be the main question. Now, Sir, Travancore-Cochin is an existing State and Malabar is to be integrated with that State to form the proposed Kerala State. But the Madras State is claiming the Southern parts of Travancore-Cochin State on linguistic considerations. It is a matter which has to be settled between two States at Government level. I do not wish, therefore, to put forth argument for or against the claims of these States. However, this much I have to say : Malabar, willingly or unwillingly, is going to be separated from Madras State and integrated with Travancore-Cochin State. It is only natural and just that we the people of Malabar feel strongly that that State should not be made poorer. Our association with the Madras State is of about two hundred years standing. It is not a pleasant thing that we are about to be separated and that long association be terminated. But things have gone so far that wailing over that aspect will not be of any purpose at this juncture. Now I have to say that the main theme

[Sri K. Uppi] [24th November 1955]

of the present discussion is what portion should be taken away from Travancore-Cochin State and from Malabar before it is separated from Madras State and integrated with Travancore-Cochin State. It may not be possible for us from Malabar to make our voice heard in proper quarters because we are so poorly represented in this House and in Parliament. This feeble position of Malabar is taken advantage of by our Tamil and Kannadiga friends and they claim portions which naturally and justly belong to Malabar. According to the recommendations of the States Reorganization Commission, the whole taluk of Kasaragod should go with Malabar and be integrated with the proposed Kerala State. But the Kannadigas are claiming half of it. The proposed Karnataka State will be one of the biggest States in the country and Kerala State will be the smallest and poorest but the most densely populated State in the Indian Union. The Kannadigas admit that that portion of Kasaragod taluk lying south of Chandragiri river can be integrated with Malabar as the language of the majority is Malayalam. They also admit the language of the majority of the people of that portion of this taluk lying north of the Chandragiri river is Malayalam. But they contend that as the medium of instruction in schools in this area is Kannada and that in the matter of land tenures and in some other respects the people are more akin to South Kanara than to Malabar, it should go to Karnataka State. The total population of this portion of Kasaragod taluk lying north of Chandragiri river is 207,518 as stated by the Leader of the House. Out of this 111,000 are Malayalees and only about 18,000 are Kannadigas. But the language taught in schools is Kannada. Is this one fact alone sufficient to separate this area from South Kanara and integrate it with Malabar? It cannot be denied that a great injustice was being done to the majority people of this part by imposing another language for their mother-tongue. For the sake of 18,000 people the language of 189,000 people has been sacrificed. It is neither fair nor just that this huge Malayalee population of this area should be denied the right of getting their education through their own mother-tongue. It is said that ninety per cent of the elementary schools in this portion of Kasaragod taluk is Kannada schools. I ask: is it fair or just that Malayalam-speaking majority of this area should be compelled for ever to educate their children in a language other than their own mother-tongue, when everybody else is given the facility to educate his children in his mother-tongue? On the other hand, for this one reason alone this part of Kasaragod taluk also should go with Malabar.

It is also said that the land tenure system in the northern portion is different from that in the southern portion. If this argument is accepted as a reason for not integrating this part with Malabar, then for the same reason Malabar district should not be integrated with Travancore-Cochin State. The land tenure system and revenue system in that State are different from those in Malabar. But Malabar is going to be integrated with Travancore-Cochin State. We are not fair to the States Reorganization Commission when we say that they unreasonably recommended the inclusion of the

24th November 1955] [Sri K. Uppi]

entire Kasaragod taluk in Kerala State. They must have had sufficient material for their conclusions. They had gone to the spot and made enquiries. The Members of States Reorganization Commission have no particular interest in Karnataka or Kerala. Therefore, I submit the entire taluk must be integrated with Malabar and go into Kerala State.

Another point that I want to bring to the notice of this House is about the attempt to mutilate Malabar. All our brethren, with whom we have been in close association during the last two hundred years and who should treat us with sympathy and brotherly feeling, are trying to grab as much portion of it as possible before it is separated. For instance, Gudalur taluk was part of Malabar. Because of its distance from Kozhikode and transport and conveyance difficulties in those days, for administrative convenience, the Britisher attached it to the Nilgiris district in 1877. But on more than one occasion after that, the Madras Government attempted to give it back to Malabar. But the heads of the Malabar district stood in the way with the plea that they were already having very heavy work in administering the district of Malabar without Gudalur. As regards the population statistics I could not get the census figures. But I have analysed the voters' list published by this Government. There are 45,598 voters in Gudalur taluk out of which 25,717 are Malayalees and 12,085 are Chettis who also are more or less Malayalees, in their habits, customs and ways of life. All the members who have been elected from that area to the local boards till recently are Malayalees. The people there have got marital relations with the people of Malabar. Gudalur is on the western slope of the Western Ghats and is an integral part of the Wynaad taluk of Malabar district socially, economically linguistically and in every other respect. It is not at all fair or just to detach it from Malabar. Malabar is a part and parcel of this State at present. The Madras Government are the administrative head of Malabar and they should take care of the interests of that district as well until it is integrated with Kerala. I say the Government have a duty to perform by Malabar. They must see that Malabar gets its due share when separated. We should not be sent away without sufficient resources to maintain ourselves like the widow of a karnavan of a tarwad when the karnavan dies. Malabar must be given the assets that are due to it. Though the Hon. Leader of the House was fair in his speech in moving the motion, yet when he dealt with the question of Tamil-speaking areas, he adopted an attitude of grabbing. He asked for inclusion in Tamilnad of 14 villages of Chittur taluk in which it is said there is a Tamil-speaking majority and also he claimed a portion of Palghat taluk. This also is not fair. The Government should be not only just but also generous. After all, only the one district of Malabar is going to be affiliated to the smallest State and that district must be given sufficient resources to maintain itself.

With these words I commend my amendment to the House.

[24th November 1955]

11-30
a.m.

SRI A. RATNAM : Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I would like to know whether I will be given a chance to speak. I asked the Hon. Speaker and he allotted me 15 minutes yesterday.

DEPUTY SPEAKER : The understanding is that only the Party Leaders will be given a chance to speak to-day. So, I call the hon. the Leader of the Opposition to speak now.

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI : உதவி சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே, நான்கு நாட்களாக ராஜ்ய புனரமைப்பு கமிஷனுடைய சிபாரிசுகள் சம்பந்தமாக விவாதங்கள் நடந்து அவை முடிவடையும்படியான தருவாயில் நாம் இன்றைக்கு இருக்கிறோம். இந்த சபையில் நடந்த விவாதங்களையெல்லாம் ஒட்டுமொத்தமாக எடுத்து கூர்ந்து கவனித்தால் வருத்தப்படவேண்டிய விஷயம் தான் ரொம்ப அதிகமாக தொனிக்கிறது. ஆனால் உண்மை என்ன? எங்கள் கம்யூனிஸ்டு கட்சி சம்பந்தப்பட்டவரையில் மட்டுமில்லை, இந்த நாட்டில் இருக்கக்கூடிய மக்கள் சம்பந்தப்பட்டமட்டில் இன்று நாம் சந்தோஷிக்க வேண்டிய ஒரு சந்தர்ப்பத்தில் இருக்கிறோம் என்பதை ஞாபகப்படுத்த விரும்புகிறேன். ஏனென்றால், இந்த நாட்டில் நீண்டகாலமாக, சமார் 1905-ம் வருஷம் முதற்கொண்டே மொழியை அடிப்படையாகக்கொண்டு மாகாணங்கள் அமைக்கப்படவேண்டுமென்று மக்கள் கிளர்ச்சி செய்திருக்கிறார்கள். சமார் 50 வருஷங்களாக இந்த நாட்டில் இருக்கும்படியான சகல மக்களும் பிரிட்டிஷ் சாம்ராஜ்ய காலத்தில் இருந்த மாதிரி மாகாணங்கள் இல்லாமல் அவைகள் மொழியை அடிப்படையாகக்கொண்டு அமைக்கப்படவேண்டுமென்று செய்த கிளர்ச்சிகள், போராட்டங்கள் இரண்டும் சேர்ந்து இன்றைக்கு மிகப் பெரிய அளவுக்கு ஒரு வெற்றியைத் தேடிக்கொடுத்திருக்கிறது. அப்படிப்பட்ட ஒரு மகத்தான சம்பவம் இன்றைக்கு ஏற்பட்டிருக்கிறது என்பதை மறந்துவிட்டு ஒரு சோகக் குழி மட்டும் எழுப்பிக் கொண்டிருந்தால், நாம் உண்மையிலேயே பெருமைப்படவேண்டிய ஒரு சந்தர்ப்பத்தை இழந்துவிடுகிறோம் என்பதை ஞாபகப்படுத்த விரும்புகிறேன்.

இன்றைக்கு இந்த ராஜ்ய புனரமைப்பு கமிஷன் செய்திருக்கக்கூடிய சிபாரிசுகள் விளைவாக—நிச்சயமாக அதன் விளைவாக—சில இடங்களில் தகராறு ஏற்பட்டிருப்பது உண்மை. ஆகவே நாம் இன்றைக்கு இருக்கக்கூடிய விஷயங்களை கொஞ்சம் நன்றாக ஆலோசனை செய்துபார்க்கவேண்டிய ஒரு கட்டத்தில் இருக்கிறோம். இன்றைக்கு இந்த நாட்டில் ஒற்றுமை மிகவும் அவசியம் என்று ராஜ்ய புனரமைப்பு கமிஷன் வற்புறுத்தியிருக்கிறது. இந்த நாட்டில் ஒற்றுமை மிகவும் முக்கியமானது என்று காங்கிரஸ் தலைவர்கள் வற்புறுத்தியிருக்கிறார்கள். கனம் ஸ்ரீ சி. சரமணியம் நான்கு நாட்களுக்கு முன்பு இந்த சபையில் பேசக்கூடிய காலத்தில் முதல் பீடிகையாக அதைத்தான் போட்டுக்கொண்டார். ஆகவே விவாதத்தில் இருக்கக்கூடிய விஷயம் இந்த நாட்டில் ஒற்றுமையை எப்படி ஏற்படுத்துவது என்பதைப்பற்றியது. இந்த நாட்டில் ஒற்றுமையை ஏற்படுத்துவதற்கு வழி என்ன என்பது இன்றைக்கு இந்த நாட்டு மக்களின் முன்பு இருக்கும்படியான மிகவும் முக்கியமான விஷயம்.

கம்யூனிஸ்டுகள் சம்பந்தப்பட்டமட்டில் இந்தப் பிரச்சினையை சரித்திரபூர்வமாக ஏற்பட்ட ஒரு குறிப்பிட்ட கால கட்டத்தில் தோன்றியிருக்கின்ற பிரச்சினையாக பார்க்கிறோம். இந்த நாடு தொன்றுதொட்டு ஒற்றுமைப்பட்டிருந்த நாடாக இருந்தது கிடையாது. தமிழ்நாடு கூட சேர, சோழ, பாண்டியர்கள் ஆண்டவந்த காலத்தில் ஒற்றுமையாக இருந்தது கிடையாது. இதற்குப் பிறகு பிரிட்டிஷ் சாம்ராஜ்யம் ஏற்பட்ட காலத்திலும் இந்த நாட்டில் ஒற்றுமை ஏற்பட்டது கிடையாது. பிரிட்டிஷ் சாம்ராஜ்யம் வெளியேறிய பிறகு தான் இந்த நாட்டில் ஒற்றுமை ஏற்பட்டது. ஏன் அப்போது ஒற்றுமை ஏற்பட்டது? ஒற்றுமை என்று சொன்னால் மானசீகமான விஷயம் அல்ல. ஜனங்கள் ஒன்றாகச் சேருகிறார்கள் என்றால் அவர்கள் ஒரு மானசீகமான லக்ஷியத்திற்காக ஒன்றாகச் சேருவது கிடையாது. அவர்களுடைய தினசரி வாழ்க்கையில் அவர்களுடைய லக்ஷியங்களை நிறைவேற்றுவதற்கு ஜனங்கள்

24th November 1955]

[Sri P. Ramamurthi]

ஒன்றாகச் சேர்ந்து வாழவேண்டிய அவசியம் ஏற்பட்டால், அவர்கள் நிச்சயமாக ஒன்றாகச் சேருவார்கள். அந்த அடிப்படையில் சென்ற காலத்தில் இருந்திருக்கக்கூடிய சமுதாய அமைப்பில் ஒன்றாகச் சேரவேண்டிய அவசியம் ஏற்படவில்லை. ஆனால் உலகத்தில் இருக்கக்கூடிய சமுதாயத்தின் வளர்ச்சியைப்போல இந்த நாட்டில் இருக்கக்கூடிய சமுதாயம் மேலும் மேலும் வளர்ந்துபோகக்கூடிய காலத்தில், இந்த நாட்டின் பொருளாதார வளர்ச்சி மேலும் மேலும் வளரக்கூடிய காலத்தில் ஜனங்கள் ஒன்றாகச் சேரவேண்டிய சந்தர்ப்பம் கிடைக்கிறது. அந்த சமுதாயம் மேலும் மேலும் வளரும்போது பிற்காலத்தில் என்ன ஏற்படுகிறது? பிரிட்டிஷ் சாம்ராஜ்யம் இந்த நாட்டில் ஏற்பட்ட காலத்தில் பெரு முதலாளித்துவம் ஏற்பட்டது. ஆகவே முதலாளிகள் என்ற ஒரு தனி இனம் ஏற்பட்டது. அவர்கள் ஒரு தேசிய இனம் என்ற எண்ணம் ஏற்பட்டது. நிச்சயமாக முதலாளிகள் சமுதாய அமைப்பின் வளர்ச்சிப்போக்கில், ஒரே பிரதேசத்தில் வசிக்கக் கூடிய மக்களிடத்திலும், ஒரே பானைப் பேசக்கூடிய மக்களிடத்திலும் பழக்கவழக்கங்கள், கலாசாரங்கள் ஆகியவை ஒன்றாக இருக்கக்கூடிய காலத்தில், தேசிய இனம் என்பது ஏற்பட்டதான் செய்கிறது. தமிழர்கள், இதை மறுத்தாலும்கூட தமிழ் கவிதை எடுத்துக் கொண்டால் சமீபத்தில் தான் தேசியக் கவிதா அரங்கத்தாரால் போற்றப்படும் ஸ்ரீ நாமக்கல் ராமலிங்கம் பிள்ளை அவர்கள்

“தமிழன் என்றொரு இனமுண்டு,
தனியே அவனுக்கோர் குணமுண்டு.”

என்று பாடக்கூடிய நிலை ஏற்பட்டிருக்கிறது. இதற்கு முன்பு அம்மாதிரி பாடக்கூடிய கவிதை நாம் பார்த்திருக்க முடியாது. ஆகவே, தேசிய இனப் பிரச்சனை என்பது சரித்திரபூர்வமாக ஒரு குறிப்பிட்ட காலகட்டத்தில் ஏற்படுகிறது என்ற மார்க்ஸின் கண்ணோட்டத்துடன் தான் கம்யூனிஸ்ட் கட்சி இந்த பிரச்சனையை எந்தக் காலத்திலும் அணுகி வந்திருக்கிறது.

SRI S. SWAYAMPRAKASAM : ஸ்ரீ பி. ராமமூர்த்தி அவர்கள் இப்போதுதான் “தமிழன் என்று ஒரு இனம் உண்டு” என்று ஸ்ரீ நாமக்கல் ராமலிங்கம் பிள்ளை அவர்கள் பாடியிருப்பதாகச் சொன்னார்கள். பாக்கித் தமிழ் இலக்கியங்களில் அந்த மாதிரி எதுவும் சொல்லப்படவில்லை என்று சொன்னார். சங்க காலத்திலிருந்தே தமிழ் இலக்கியங்களைப் பார்த்தால் எங்கெங்கு எல்லாமோ சென்று கப்பல் ஓட்டிய தமிழர்களைப்பற்றியெல்லாம் சொல்லப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. ஆகவே அவர் தெரியாததைப் பற்றி பேச வேண்டாம் என்று சொல்லிக்கொள்ள விரும்புகிறேன்.

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI : இன உணர்ச்சி என்று நான் பேசுகிறேனே ஒழிய தமிழ் என்பது வேறு. தமிழ் பேசக்கூடிய ஒரே இனத்தைச் சேர்ந்தவர்கள் ஒரே அரசியலின் கீழ் வாழவேண்டுமென்ற உணர்ச்சி சங்க காலத்திலிருந்தே ஏற்படவில்லை என்றுதான் நான் சொல்கிறேன். சங்க காலத்தில் சேர, சோழ, பாண்டிய நாடுகள் என்றும், அதே மாதிரி கொங்கு நாடு என்றும் பல ராஜ்யங்களாகப் பிரிந்து இருந்திருக்கிறார்கள். ஆனால் தமிழர்கள் என்ற ஒரு தேசிய இனத்தைச் சேர்ந்தவர்கள் ஒரே சமுதாயத்திலும், ஒரே அரசியலின் கீழும் வாழ வேண்டும் என்ற எண்ணம் தேசிய இயக்கத்தின் ஒரு குறிப்பிட்ட காலகட்டத்தில் தான் தோன்றி வளர்ந்தது. அந்த உண்மையை இப்போது நாம் உணருகிறோம். ஆகவே இந்த நாட்டில் இருக்கும் தேசிய இனங்கள், தேசிய இயக்கத்தின் பாரம்பரியத்தில், ஒன்றாகச் சேர்ந்து நேசமாக வாழவேண்டும் என்ற உணர்ச்சி ஏற்பட்டு வளர்ந்தது. இந்த அடிப்படையைக் கொண்டதான் நாங்கள் இந்தப் பிரச்சனையைப் பார்க்கிறோம். ஆகவே அப்படிப் பார்க்கும்போது “எப்படி இந்த பிரிட்டிஷ் ஏகாதிபத்தியத்தை எதிர்க்கவேண்டிய நிப்பந்தம் ஏற்பட்டு ஏகாதிபத்தியப் போராட்டத்தில் ஒற்றுமை வளர்ந்ததோ, அதே மாதிரி சுதந்திரம் கிடைத்த பிறகு அந்த ஒற்றுமையை மேலும் பலப்படுத்துவதற்காக இன்றைக்குக்கூடிய சமுதாய அமைப்பைத் தகர்த்தெரிந்து ஒரு புதிய சமுதாய அமைப்பை ஏற்படுத்த வேண்டியது அவசியம்” என்று கூறுகிறோம். ஆகவே அப்படி நாட்டைச் சீரமைப்பதற்கு

[Sri P. Ramamurthi]

[24th November 1955]

காக தேசிய இனங்களையெல்லாம் ஒன்றாகச் சேர்க்க வேண்டிய சந்தர்ப்பம் ஏற்படும்பொழுது ஏற்கெனவே கிடைத்திருக்கும் ஒற்றுமையை மேலும் மேலும் கெட்டிப்படுத்தி பலப்படுத்தினால் தான் இந்தியாவில் மிகப் பெரிய ஒற்றுமை ஏற்படுவது சாத்தியம். இந்த அடிப்படை உண்மையை மறந்துவிட்டால் ஒற்றுமை ஏற்படுவது சாத்தியம் அல்ல. ராஜ்ய சீரமைப்புக் கமிஷன் சொல்லியிருக்கிறது “It was the determination of the Indian people to rid themselves of foreign domination and to build up a life for themselves as a free people, that created the present unity of India, sweeping away not merely the alien rule, but also the hereditary rulers who had divided up India and thus stood in the way of that unity” என்று அதாவது, பிரிட்டிஷ் சாம்ராஜ்யத்தை எதிர்த்திருக்கக்கூடிய காலகட்டத்தில் தோன்றி வளர்ந்த ஒற்றுமைதான் இன்றைக்கு இருக்கக்கூடிய ஒற்றுமை. அந்த ஒற்றுமையைப் பாதுகாக்க வேண்டும், வளர்க்க வேண்டும். எப்படி வளர்ப்பது? பல்வேறு தேசிய இனங்களைக் கொண்டிருக்கக்கூடிய மக்களுக்கு அவர்களுடைய தேசிய இனங்களுக்கு ஏற்ப அவர்கள் தங்கள் மொழிகளை வளர்ப்பதற்கு சந்தர்ப்பம் கிடைத்து, அதே நேரத்தில் ஏற்றத் தாழ்வுகளோடு வளர்ச்சியடைந்திருக்கக்கூடிய பல்வேறு தேசிய இனங்கள் சீக்கிரத்தில் நல்ல வளர்ச்சி பெறுவதற்கு வேண்டிய சகோதர மனோபாவத்தோடு, இந்த நாட்டில் ஒரு அரசியலும், பொருளாதாரமும் அமையுமாறால், நிச்சயமாக இப்படி ஒரு பிரிவினை மனோபாவம் ஏற்படாது.

11-40
a.m.

அதுதான் இந்நாட்டின் ஒற்றுமைக்கு அஸ்திவாரம் என்று நாங்கள் அடிக்கடி கூறிக்கொண்டு வருகிறோம். அந்தக் கண்ணோட்டத்துடன் இந்தப் பிரச்சினையைப் பார்க்க வேண்டும். அந்த அடிப்படையில் பார்க்கும்போது நீண்ட காலமாக நம் நாடு மொழிவாரி அடிப்படையில் பிரிக்கப்படவேண்டும் என்று நாங்கள் சொல்லிக் கொண்டிருக்கிறோம். அந்த அடிப்படையில் நாடுகளில் ராஜ்யங்கள் அமைக்கப்பட வேண்டும் என்று கிளர்ச்சி செய்து கொண்டும் வந்தார்கள். கடைசியில் இந்தக் கிளர்ச்சியினால் ஜனங்களிடையே ஒற்றுமை ஏற்பட்டது. அதன் பிறகு அது சீரழிய ஆரம்பமாயிற்று. காங்கிரஸ் ஸ்தாபனம் சம்பந்தப்பட்ட மட்டில், அதன் கமிட்டிகள் சம்பந்தப்பட்ட மட்டில் காங்கிரஸ் ஸ்தாபனம் மேலிடம் சம்பந்தப்பட்ட மட்டில் இதை ஒரு பிரச்சனையாக வைத்து அதாவது மொழிவாரி அடிப்படையில் ராஜ்யங்களைப் பிரிக்க வேண்டும் என்ற பிரச்சினையை அடிப்படையாகக் கொண்டு தேர்தலுக்கு நின்றார்கள். 1946-ம் வருஷம் தேர்தலுக்கு நின்ற காலம் வரையில், இந்நாட்டு அதிகாரம் அவர்களுடைய கைக்கு மாறிய காலம் வரையில், அவர்கள் இந்தக் கொள்கையையே கடைப்பிடித்து வந்தார்கள். இது ஒரு நியாயமான கோரிக்கை என்றும் கருதி வந்தார்கள். இது ஜனநாயக அடிப்படையில் எழுந்திருக்கும் கோரிக்கை என்று நினைத்து வந்தார்கள். அதன் பிறகு 1946-ம் வருஷம் தேர்தலுக்கு நின்ற பிறகு, 1947-ம் வருஷம் அதிகாரம் மாறுதல் அடைந்த பிறகு அவர்களுடைய நிலைமை மாறிவிட்டது. இன்றைக்கு அவர்கள் என்ன சொல்லுகிறார்கள்? மொழியை மட்டும் கணக்கில் எடுத்துக் கொள்ளக் கூடாது, வேறு பல விஷயங்களையும் கணக்கில் எடுத்துக் கொள்ள வேண்டும், ஒற்றுமையை இந்நாட்டில் பாதுகாக்க அதை கணக்கில் எடுத்துக் கொள்ள வேண்டும் என்று பல காரணங்களைச் சொல்லுகிறார்கள். அப்படி பல காரணங்களைக் காட்டி இந்தப் பிரச்சினையை ஒத்திப் போட முயற்சி செய்தார்கள். அப்படி எட்டு வருஷங்கள் முயற்சி செய்து பார்த்தார்கள். ஆனால் இந்நாட்டில் என்ன நடந்தது? அதனால் இந்நாட்டில் ஒற்றுமை வளர்ந்ததா என்று பார்க்க வேண்டும். ஒற்றுமை வளர்ச்சி அடைவதற்கு பதிலாக ஒற்றுமை சீரழிந்து தான் வந்தது. இதைதான் இப்பொழுதுள்ள யதார்த்த பிரச்சனை. இதைத் தான் நான் எடுத்துச் சொல்ல ஆசைப்படுகிறேன்.

நாட்டில் ஒற்றுமையை ஏற்படுத்த வேண்டும் என்று சொல்லுகிறவர்கள் காங்கிரஸ்காரர்களுக்குள்ளேயே ஒற்றுமையை ஏற்படுத்த முடியவில்லை. அங்கேயும் ஏற்கெனவே இருந்த ஒற்றுமை இப்பொழுது சீரழிந்து வருகிறது. மலையாள காங்கிரஸ்காரர்களுக்கும் தமிழ் காங்கிரஸ்காரர்களுக்கும்

24th November 1955] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

சண்டை, வங்காள காங்கிரஸ்காரர்களுக்கும் பீகார் காங்கிரஸ்காரர்களுக்கும் சண்டை, மகராஷ்டிர காங்கிரஸ்காரர்களுக்கும் குஜராத்தி காங்கிரஸ்காரர்களுக்கும் சண்டை. அதனால் என்ன தெரிகிறது? காங்கிரஸ்காரர்களுக்குள்ளேயே ஒற்றுமை இல்லை என்பது நன்றாகத் தெரிகிறது. கட்சியில் ஒற்றுமையை ஏற்படுத்த முடியாதபோது பண்டித நேரு அவர்கள் நாட்டில் ஒற்றுமையை ஏற்படுத்த முயலுகிறார். நாட்டில் ஒற்றுமையை ஏற்படுத்துவதற்கு முயலுகிறவர்களுக்கு கட்சியில் ஒற்றுமையைக் கொண்டுவருவதற்கு முடியவில்லை. அதற்குக் காரணம் என்ன என்பது தெரியவில்லை. அதன் காரணத்தைத்தான் நாம் பார்க்க வேண்டும். அது தான் கம்யூனிஸ்ட் கட்சி கூறக்கூடிய விஷயம். இதுதான் யதார்த்த விஷயம்.

காங்கிரஸ் மேலிடத்தில் இந்தப் பிரச்சினையை ஒத்திப்போட முற்பட்டார்கள். எஸ்.ஆர்.சி. கமிஷனும் தன்னுடைய தீர்ப்பை ஒத்திப்போட முயற்சி செய்தது. ஆனால் ஆந்திர மாகாணப் பிரிவினை ஏற்பட்டதன் காரணமாக ஜனங்களுடைய போராட்டம் மேலும் மேலும் வளர்ந்து வந்தது. ஆகவே இந்தப் பிரச்சினையை மேலும் ஒத்திப்போட முடியாது என்ற ஒரு முடிவிற்கு அவர்கள் வந்தார்கள். அன்றைக்கு அவர்கள் என்ன சொன்னார்கள்? ஆந்திர பிரிவினை ஏற்பட்ட பிறகு அதாவது சென்னை ராஜ்யத்தைப் பிரித்த காலத்தில் அவர்கள் என்ன சொன்னார்கள். "It is a matter for rejoicing not only for the Andhra people but for the entire democratic people of this country".

அன்று ஆந்திர ராஜ்யப் பிரிவினை ஏற்பட்ட பிறகு அது ஆந்திர மக்களுடைய விஷயம் மட்டும் அல்ல, அது இந்நாட்டிலுள்ள ஜனநாயக எண்ணம் படைத்திருக்கும் சகல மக்களுடைய பிரச்சனையாகி விட்டது. ஆந்திரப் பிரிவினையினால் இந்நாட்டில் மொழிவாரி அடிப்படையில் எல்லா ராஜ்யங்களையும் பிரிக்கவேண்டும் என்ற எண்ணம் ஏற்பட்டது. அதற்கு வேண்டிய ஊக்கத்தையும், வேகத்தையும் ஜனங்களிடத்தில் சிதப்பி விட்டது. அதன் பிறகுதான் மொழி அடிப்படையில் ராஜ்யங்கள் பிரிக்கப்பட வேண்டும் என்ற சிளாச்சி வலுவடைந்து வந்தது. அப்பொழுதுதான் எஸ்.ஆர்.சி. கமிஷன் இந்தப் பிரச்சினையை ஒத்திப்போட முடியாது என்ற முடிவிற்கு வந்தது. இந்தக் கோரிக்கை பெரிய கோரிக்கை என்று உணர்ந்தார்கள். இந்தக் கோரிக்கையை பெரிய அளவிற்கு ஒத்துக் கொள்ளக்கூடிய நிர்ப்பந்தம் அவர்களுக்கு ஏற்பட்டது. அதற்கு ஆதாரமாக அவர்கள் தங்களுடைய ரிப்போர்ட்டில் 50 பக்கங்கள் வரையில் அதைப் பற்றி எழுதியிருக்கிறார்கள். மொழி அடிப்படையில் ராஜ்யங்களை பிரிக்கக் கூடாது என்பதற்காக அவர்கள் பெரிய "ஆர்க்யுமென்ட்" கொடுத்திருக்கிறார்கள். அவ்வளவையும் கொடுத்த பிறகு கடைசியில் அவர்கள் சொன்னது என்ன? 16 மாகாணங்களில் 14 மாகாணங்கள் மொழி அடிப்படையில் பிரிக்கப்பட வேண்டும் என்று தங்களுடைய சிபாரிசில் சொல்லி விட்டு இரண்டு மாகாணங்கள் தனியாக இருக்க வேண்டும், அவைகள் மொழி அடிப்படையில் பிரிக்கப்படாமல் இருக்க வேண்டும் என்றும் சொல்லியிருக்கிறார்கள். இந்த இரண்டு மாகாணங்கள் சம்பந்தப்பட்ட மட்டில் இந்த இரண்டு மாகாணங்களும் ஏற்கெனவே அவர்கள் சொன்ன மாதிரி மொழி அடிப்படையில் பிரிக்கப்படக்கூடாது என்று சொல்லவில்லை. ஆனால் வேறு காரணத்தைக் காட்டுகிறார்கள். அவைகளை பிரித்தால் நாட்டில் ஒற்றுமைக்கு பங்கம் ஏற்படும் என்றும் சொல்லியிருக்கிறார்கள். மகராஷ்டிரர்களையும், குஜராத்திகளையும் கொண்ட பம்பாய் ராஜ்யம் இரட்டை மொழி ராஜ்யமாக இருக்க வேண்டும் என்றும், அதற்கு வேண்டிய காரணங்களையும் அவர்கள் கூறியிருக்கிறார்கள். ஆகவே இந்த நிலைமையில் பார்க்கும்போது நாட்டில் என்ன நிலைமை ஏற்படுகிறது? அந்தக் கண்ணோட்டத்துடன் இதை பார்க்க வேண்டும். இதிலிருந்து என்ன தெரிகிறது? இந்நாட்டில் இருக்கும் பெரும் முதலாளிகளுக்கு பாதுகாப்பு அளிக்கவேண்டும் என்பது காங்கிரஸ் மேலிடத்தின் அடிப்படை நோக்கமாக இருக்கிறது. பெரும் முதலாளிகளுக்கு ஏற்படக்கூடிய மனோபாவம் மற்ற இடங்களுக்கும் பிரதிபலிக்கிறது. அதற்கு வேண்டிய அவசியமும் ஏற்படுகிறது. "The city of Bombay stands in special relation to

[Sri P. Ramamurthi] [24th November 1955]

Maharashtra, Gujarat, and to India as a whole . . . industrially and commercially, it is the hub of India's financial and industrial activity . . . Some expert evidence was also let before us to show how the commercial and financial interests of the Bombay City and of India as a whole would be affected by a sudden change in the form of the Government in Bombay."

பம்பாய் நகரத்தின் உருவம் மாறிவிடப் போவதில்லை. ஆனால் பெரும் முதலாளிகளுக்கு பெரிய பாதகம் ஏற்பட்டு விடும் என்பதைப் பற்றி சாட்சியம் கூறியிருக்கிறார்கள். பம்பாய் நகர அரசாங்கத்தின் உருவம் மாறி விடப்போவதில்லை. அங்குள்ள ஆள்கள் தான் மாறலாம். அங்கு மகாராஷ்டிரார்கள் மெஜாரிட்டியாக இருக்கிறார்கள், குஜராத் திங்கள் கொஞ்சமாக இருக்கிறார்கள். அதனால் பாதகம் ஏற்படும் என்று காரணம் காட்டியிருக்கிறார்கள். மொழி அடிப்படையில் ராஜ்யம் ஏற்படவேண்டும் என்று சொல்லும்போது அவர்கள் இதைச் சொல்லியிருக்கிறார்கள். அதனால் அவர்களுக்கு ஒரு கொள்கை கிடைப்பாது. ஒரே கொள்கையின் அடிப்படையில் இந்த ரிப்போர்டை தயாரித்திருந்தால் ராஜ்யங்கள் ஜனநாயக அடிப்படையில் அமைந்திருக்கும். தகராறு கொள்கைகளை வைத்துக்கொண்டு பிரிவினை செய்திருக்கிறார்கள். அதனால் தான் அதை சமாளிக்க வேண்டிய நிலைமை ஏற்பட்டிருக்கிறது.

கடைசியாக மாகாணங்களைப் பிரிக்க ஒரு கொள்கையை வகுத்திருக்கிறார்கள். எல்லை சம்பந்தமாக ஒரு கொள்கையையும் அவர்கள் கடைப்பிடிக்கவில்லை. (Balances and checks) என்ற கொள்கையை அவர்கள் கடைப்பிடித்திருக்கிறார்கள். எங்கும் அதை சரியாக கடைப்பிடிக்கவில்லை. ஏதோ கொஞ்சம் தாலாகாக்களை எடுத்து இங்கே போடுவதும், சிலவற்றை எடுத்து அங்கே போடுவதுமாகத் தான் செய்திருக்கிறார்கள். இப்படி இங்கிருப்பதை அங்கு போட்டு, அங்கிருப்பதை இங்கு போட்டு எல்லோரையும் திருப்தி செய்திருக்கிறார்கள். இந்த விதத்தில் அவர்கள் பிரிவினை செய்து ரிபோர்ட் தயாரித்திருக்கிறார்கள்.

THE HON. SRI K. KAMARAJ : அது காங்கிரஸ் ரிபோர்ட் அல்ல.

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI : காங்கிரஸ் ரிபோர்ட் இல்லா விட்டாலும் காங்கிரஸ் சம்பந்தப்பட்ட ரிபோர்ட். 1947-ம் வருஷம் வரையிலும் இந்த ரிபோர்ட்டை காங்கிரஸ் காரிய கமிட்டி ஒத்துக் கொண்டிருக்கிறது. சிறிய மாறுதல்களைக் கூட ஒத்துக் கொண்டிருக்கிறது. எந்த அடிப்படைக் கொள்கையில் இதை தயார் செய்திருக்கிறது? இன்றைக்கு இருக்கும் நிலைமையில் பாலன்செஸ் அன்ட் செக்ஸ் (Balances and checks) என்ற முறையில் இதை அமைத்திருக்கிறார்கள். இந்தக் கண்ணோட்டத்துடன் இதைப் பார்க்கும் போது எல்லை சம்பந்தமாக இந்தநாட்டில் எங்கும் தகராறுகள் கிளம்பி இருக்கின்றன. எல்லைத் தகராறுகள் சம்பந்தமாக ஏற்கெனவே தகராறுகள் ஏற்பட்டு நாட்டின் ஒற்றுமை சீரழிந்து விட்டது. அந்த நிலைமையிலேயே இன்றைக்கும் போய்க் கொண்டிருக்கிறது. ஆகவே இதில் ஒரு பெரிய வெற்றி ஏற்பட்டு விட்டது என்று சொல்ல முடியாது. வெற்றி ஏற்பட்டிருக்கிறது என்று சொல்லும் காலத்தில் மேலும் மேலும் தகராறுகள் தான் அதிகமாகிக் கொண்டிருக்கின்றன. எவ்வளவோ தகராறுகள் ஏற்பட்டிருக்கின்றன. எந்த விதத்தில் தகராறுகள் ஏற்பட்டன என்பதைப் பார்க்க வேண்டும். இதில் காங்கிரஸ் கொள்கை என்ன?

இது சம்பந்தப்பட்ட வரையில் கனம் சி. சுப்பிரமணியம் அவர்கள் தன்னுடைய பிரசங்கத்தில் கொள்கையை எடுத்துக் காட்டியிருக்கிறார் என்று நினைக்கிறேன். கனம் முதல் மந்திரி அவர்கள் சொன்ன மாதிரி இது காங்கிரஸ் கமிட்டியின் ரிபோர்ட் இல்லை என்று சொன்னாலும், காங்கிரஸ் கொள்கை சம்பந்தப்பட்ட வரை கனம் சி. சுப்பிரமணியம் அவர்கள் பேசிய பேச்சு காங்கிரஸ் அரசாங்கத்தினுடைய பேச்சு என்றே நான் நினைக்கிறேன். காங்கிரஸ் அரசாங்கத்தின் பேச்சு காங்கிரஸ் காரியக் கமிட்டி, பிரதம மந்திரி கொண்டிருக்கும் கொள்கையை பிரதிபலிக்கிறது என்று கருதுகிறேன்.

24th November 1955] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

ஆகவே இந்த பிரதிபலிப்பை எடுத்துக் கொண்டால் எஸ்.ஆர்.சி. கமிட்டி ரிபோர்ட்டுக்கும் அவர்களுடைய மனோபாவத்துக்கும் என்ன வித்யாசம் இருக்கிறது என்பது தான் எனக்குத் தெரியவில்லை. நேற்றைய தினம் கனம் சி. சுப்ரமணியம் அவர்கள் பேசிய காலத்தில் கனம் விநாயகம் உள்பட இன்னும் பலர் தேவிசுளம், பீர்மேடு சம்பந்தமாக நன்றாக எடுத்துக் காட்டி விவரித்துச் சொன்னார் என்று சொன்னார்கள்.

ஆனால் அவர் பேசியது சரியல்ல என்பதுதான் என்னுடைய அபிப்பிராயம். 11-50 a.m.

ஏனென்று கேட்டால் இன்றைய தினம் தமிழர்கள் ஜெயிக்கிறார்களா, மலையாளிகள் ஜெயிக்கிறார்களா என்பது அல்ல பிரச்சனை. இன்றைய தினம் தமிழர்கள் நன்றாக வாதாடுகிறார்களா, மலையாளிகள் நன்றாக வாதாடுகிறார்களா என்பது அல்ல பிரச்சனை.

கனம் சுப்ரமணியம் அவர்கள் பேச்சை எடுத்துக் கொண்டால் ராஜ்ய சீரமைப்புக் கமிஷனுடைய யாதாஸ்தில் அடங்கியிருக்கிற பல விஷயங்களையும் ஒப்புக் கொள்ளுகிறார். மொழி அடிப்படையில் மாத்திரம் ராஜ்யங்களை அமைப்பது என்ற கொள்கையையும் அவர் கண்டிக்கிறார். ராஜ்யங்களை மொழி அடிப்படையில் அமைப்பது என்ற ஒரு பக்கக் கண்ணோட்டத்தோடு கூடவே, “நிர்வாக செளகர்யத்தையொட்டியும்”, இந்த தேசத்தில் இருக்கக் கூடிய இயற்கை வளங்களை சமமாக எல்லா ராஜ்யங்களும் பங்கிட்டுக் கொள்ளும்படியும் ராஜ்யங்களைப் பிரிக்க வேண்டுமென்று சொல்லுகிறார்.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : ‘சமமாக’ என்று நான் சொல்லவில்லை.

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI : “சமமாக” என்று இல்லாவிட்டாலும், “நியாயமாக” பங்கிட்டுக் கொள்ள வேண்டுமென்று சொல்லுகிறார். ராஜ்யங்களை அமைப்பதில் பிரதான நோக்கம் மொழியை அடிப்படையாகக் கொண்டு பிரிப்பது அல்ல. ராஜ்யத்தின் பொருளாதார, நிர்வாக செளகர்யத்தை அடிப்படையாக வைத்துக் கொண்டே ராஜ்யங்கள் பிரிக்கப்பட வேண்டுமென்று சொல்லுகிறார். இதைத் தானே ராஜ்ய சீரமைப்புக் கமிஷனும் சொல்லுகிறது. யார் சொல்வது நியாயம், யார் சொல்வது தப்பு என்று நாம் எப்படி நிர்ணயிப்பது? இது விஷயத்தில் கம்யூனிஸ்டுக் கட்சி நியாயமாக நடந்து கொள்ள வேண்டுமென்று சொல்லுகிறார்.

கம்யூனிஸ்டுக் கட்சி சம்பந்தப்பட்ட மட்டில் ஆரம்பம் முதற்கொண்டே ஒரே கொள்கையைத் தான் அவர்கள் பின்பற்றி வருகிறார்கள். அதாவது இந்தப் பிரச்சனையை கிராமங்களின் அடிப்படையில் தான் பிரிக்கவேண்டுமென்று அவர்கள் ஆதியிலிருந்தே சொல்லிக் கொண்டு வருகிறார்கள்.

பாலக்காடு சம்பந்தப்பட்ட மட்டில் அங்கே சில கிராமங்கள் நமக்கு வந்தாக வேண்டும். அதே மாதிரி சித்தூர் தாலுக்கா சம்பந்தப்பட்ட மட்டில் சில கிராமங்கள் நமக்கு வந்தாக வேண்டும். நெய்யாற்றங்கரை சம்பந்தப்பட்ட மட்டில் சில கிராமங்கள் நமக்கு வந்தாக வேண்டும். இந்தப் பிரதேசங்களுக்கு எல்லாம் நாம் வரையறுத்துக் கொள்ளுகிற கொள்கையை நாம் என் கூலூர் தாலுக்காவுக்கும் பின்பற்றக் கூடாது? அப்படிப் பார்த்தால் கூலூர் தாலுக்காவை தமிழர்கள் எதற்காகக் கேட்க வேண்டும்? அங்கே மெஜாரிட்டியாக மலையாளிகள் தான் இருக்கிறார்கள் என்பது தெரியும். கிராம அடிப்படையில் பார்த்தாலும் கூலூர் தாலுக்காவில் இரண்டு கிராமங்களில் கூட மலையாளிகள் மெஜாரிட்டியாக இருக்க மாட்டார்களா? ஆனால் இந்தக் கொள்கையைக் கொண்டு அங்கே பார்க்க மாட்டார்கள்.

அதனால் தான் சொல்லுகிறேன். காங்கிரஸ் கட்சிக்கு ஒரு கொள்கை என்பதே கிடையாது. (ஸ்ரீ கே. விநாயகம் : நன்றாக கொடுங்கள்.) அதைத் தான் நான் கண்டிக்கிறேன். ஏதோ யாருக்கோ கொடுப்பது, யாரிடமிருந்தோ பிடுங்குவது என்கின்ற மனோபாவத்தோடு இந்தப் பிரச்

[Sri P. Ramamurthi] [24th November 1955]

னையை அணுகுவதே தப்பு. அவர்களுக்குக் கொடுப்பது, அவர்களுக்குக் கொடுக்காமலிருப்பது என்கின்ற பிரச்சனையே எழக்கூடாது. ஜனங்கள் சம்பந்தப்பட்ட மட்டில், அவர்களுடைய வாழ்வு சம்பந்தப்பட்டமட்டில், அவர்கள் எந்தப் பகுதி மக்களாக இருந்தாலும், மனித உணர்ச்சியோடு இந்த நாட்டிலுள்ள எந்தப் பகுதி மக்களும் பாதிக்கப்படாமலிருக்கக் கூடிய முறையில் இப்பிரச்சனைக்கு முடிவு காண வேண்டுமென்பது தான் கம்யூனிஸ்டுக் கட்சியின் கொள்கை. அதைத் தான் ஆதரிப்பதே அது வற்புறுத்திக் கொண்டு வருகிறது. தமிழ்நாடு சம்பந்தப்பட்ட மட்டில் ஒரு கொள்கை, மலையாளி சம்பந்தப்பட்ட மட்டில் மற்றொரு கொள்கை என்ற பாகுபாடு இருக்கக் கூடாது.

இந்த அடிப்படைக் கொள்கையை வைத்துக் கொண்டு காங்கிரஸ் கட்சி அணுகாததினால்தான் இன்றைக்கு நாட்டு மக்களிடையே மனக்கசப்பு அதிகப்பட்டு வருகிறது. எங்கு பார்த்தாலும் கிளர்ச்சிகள் எழுந்து கொண்டிருக்கின்றன. இந்தக் கிளர்ச்சிக்கு அடிகோலியவர்கள் காங்கிரஸ் காரர்கள். அந்த உண்மையை மறந்து விட்டு ஏதோ கம்யூனிஸ்டுக் கட்சி இந்தச் சந்தர்ப்பத்தைப் பயன்படுத்திக் கொண்டு நாட்டில் கிளர்ச்சிகளை தூண்டி விட்டு வருவதாகப் பிரசாரம் செய்து வருவது உண்மையை மறைப்பதற்காகத்தான் என்று எடுத்துக் காட்ட விரும்புகிறேன்.

மலையாளிகள் தங்களுக்கு உணவுக் கஷ்டம் அதிகம், ஆகவே நாஞ்சில் நாடு கேரள நாட்டுடனேயே இருக்க வேண்டுமென்று சொன்னபோது, 'நமக்கு உணவுப் பஞ்சம் என்றால் "பர்மா" கூட நம் ராஜ்யத்தோடு இருக்க வேண்டுமென்று சொல்வது போலிருக்கிறது' என்று அவர்களை யார் கேட்டார்கள்? பிரஜா சோஷலிஸ்டுக் கட்சி கேட்கவில்லை. காங்கிரஸ் கட்சி கேட்கவில்லை. எல்லோரும் மனச்சாட்சியைத் தொட்டுக்கொண்டு சொல்லட்டும். அந்தமாதிரியாகக் கேட்டது கம்யூனிஸ்டுக் கட்சி ஒன்று தான் என்றால் அதை யாராவது மறுக்க முடியுமா என்று கேட்கிறேன். எந்த இடத்திலே நியாயம் இருக்கிறதோ அதை ஆதரிப்பதுதான் கம்யூனிஸ்டுக் கட்சியின் கொள்கை. இனவெறி, பிரதேச வெறி கொண்டு எந்தப் பிரச்சனையையும் அந்தக் கட்சி இன்று வரை அணுகியது இல்லை. அது அணுகவும் அணுகாது என்றும் சொல்லிக் கொள்ள விரும்புகிறேன்.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM: I saw a report that a Communist Member would fast if these five taluks would go to Tamil Nad.

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI: பத்திரிகைகளில் அம்மாதிரியாகச் செய்திகள் வந்திருக்கலாம். கம்யூனிஸ்டுகளைப் பற்றி ஏதாவது தவறான செய்திகளையே பிரசுரிப்பதை சில பத்திரிகைகள் கொள்கையாகக் கொண்டிருக்கின்றன. அந்தச் செய்திக்கு மறுப்பு அனுப்பினால் அவற்றை அந்தப் பத்திரிகைகள் பிரசுரிப்பதில்லை. ஆகவே தான் அந்த மாதிரியாக எப்பொழுதாவது எங்களுடைய கட்சிப் பத்திரிகையில் வந்திருக்கிறதா என்று படித்துப் பார்க்கும்படியாகக் கேட்டுக் கொள்ளுகிறேன்.

கொள்கைத் தெளிவு இல்லாததின் காரணமாகத் தான் இன்றைக்கு காங்கிரஸ் கட்சிக்காரர்களிடையே ஒற்றுமை கிடையாது. ஆகவே தான் இன்றைக்கு வோட்டு எடுப்பதென்றால் அவரவர்கள் இஷ்டப்படியே வோட்டுப்போடலாம் என்று சொல்லி விட்டார்கள். ஆனால் கொள்கைத் தெளிவு உடைய நாங்கள் ஒருவருக்கொருவர் அபிப்பிராயபேதம் கொள்ள இடமில்லை. ஆகவே ஆரம்ப முதலே நாங்கள் இந்தக் கொள்கையை வற்புறுத்திக் கொண்டிருக்கிறோம்.

12 noon. காங்கிரஸ் அகில இந்திய கட்சி; அது சுத்தந்திரத்திற்காக பாடுபட்ட போது, ஒரு மிகப் பெரிய கொள்கையை அநுஷ்டானத்தில் வைத்திருந்தது. அதுதான் இந்திய மக்களின் சக்தி வாய்ந்த, பலமான ஒற்றுமை. இந்திய மக்களுடைய இந்த ஒற்றுமைதான், தேசிய முக்கியத்துவமாக வைக்கப்பட்டிருந்தது. ஆனால், மக்களது பிரச்சனைகளைத் தீர்க்க முன் வரும் போது, காங்கிரஸ் கட்சிக்குள்ளேயே ஒற்றுமையை ஏற்படுத்த முடிய வில்லை

24th November 1955] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

என்பதைப் பார்க்கிறோம். ஏன் இந்த நிலைமை என்பதை சிந்தனை செய்து பார்க்கவேண்டும். தற்போது இரு மக்களிடையே, இரு சாரரிடையே மிகப் பெரிய மனக் கசப்பை யார் உண்டாக்கிக் கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள்? திருவாங்கூர்-கொச்சி ஸ்டேட்டில் காங்கிரஸ் மந்திரி சபைதான் இருக்கிறது. அங்கு காங்கிரஸ் தலைவரான பணம்பள்ளி கோவிந்த மேனன் தான் முதல் மந்திரியாக இருக்கிறார். அவர் ஒரு கருத்தை தெரிவிக்கிறார் என்றால், காங்கிரஸ்காரருடைய, காங்கிரசினுடைய, அங்கிருக்கும் காங்கிரஸ் மந்திரி சபையினுடைய கருத்தைத்தான் சொல்லுவதாக ஆகும். ஏற்கனவே, பிரஜா சோஷியலிஸ்டுகளின் மந்திரி சபை அங்கிருந்தது. அந்தக் கட்சியின் தலைவர்களில் ஒருவரான பட்டம் தாணுப்பிள்ளை அந்த ஸ்டேட்டில் மந்திரி சபை அமைத்து சர்க்காரை நடத்தி வந்தார். இந்த பிரஜா சோஷியலிஸ்ட் மந்திரி சபை அப்போது என்ன காரியங்களை, என்ன கருத்தை தெரிவித்ததோ, அதைத்தான் இப்போது இருக்கும் கோவிந்த மேனனை பிரதம மந்திரியாகக் கொண்ட காங்கிரஸ் மந்திரிசபையும் தெரிவிக்கிறது. ஆனால் பிரஜா சோஷியலிஸ்ட் கட்சி சம்பந்தப்பட்ட மட்டில் இந்த ராஜ்யம் புனரமைப்பு விஷயத்தில் என்ன கொள்கையைக் கொண்டிருக்கிற தென்பது தெரியவில்லை. இங்கு அந்த கட்சித் தலைவர்களில் முக்கியஸ்தரான கனம் கே. பி. மேனன் அவர்கள் இந்த ரிப்போர்ட்டைப் பற்றி பேசும்போது என்ன சொன்னார்கள்? மொழிவாரி ராஜ்யங்களை இருக்கக்கூடாது, அமைக்கக் கூடாதென்று சொன்னார்கள், அந்த ரிப்போர்ட்டை தகர்த்தெரியவேண்டும் என்றும் பேசினார்கள். அதுதான் தன்னுடைய கட்சி அபிப்பிராயமென்று கூடக் கூறினார்கள். ஆனால் அந்தக் கட்சியினுடைய அபிப்பிராயத்தைப் பற்றி தெரிந்து கொள்ள விரும்பும்போது, அந்தக் கட்சியினுடைய National Executive-னுடைய நடவடிக்கைகளைக் கவனிக்க வேண்டும். சென்ற அக்டோபர் மாதம் 18-ம் தேதி இந்த National Executive கூடி ஒரு தீர்மானம் போட்டிருக்கிறது. அது என்ன? “The National Executive of the Praja Socialist Party which has been discussing the report of the S.R.C. for the last two days here adopted a resolution ‘welcoming the recommendations’ in so far as it fulfils in the case of the most of the provinces, the legitimate aspirations of the people for the reorganization of the existing States on linguistic basis”. ஜனங்களுடைய அபிலாஷையான, பாஷாவாரி ராஜ்யங்களை அமைக்கும் காரியத்தை இந்த ரிப்போர்ட்டு பூர்த்தி செய்வதால், இதை வரவேற்கிறோம் என்று தீர்மானம் போட்டிருக்கிறார்கள். அந்த National Executive-ல் கனம் மெம்பர், பாக்டர், கே. பி. மேனனும் ஒரு உறுப்பினர் ஆவார்கள். இவர், தான் சொல்லுவது, கட்சியினுடைய அபிப்பிராயம், அதாவது இந்த ரிப்போர்ட்டை தகர்த்தெரிந்து, மொழி வழி ராஜ்யங்கள் அமைக்கப்படாமல் செய்ய வேண்டுமென்பதுதான், கட்சியின் கருத்து என்று சொன்னால், அதை நாம் புரிந்து கொள்ள முடியவில்லை. அவர்கள் தற்போது இந்த சபையில் இல்லாததால் நான் அதைப்பற்றி அதிகம் சொல்ல வேண்டியதில்லை என்றே நினைக்கிறேன். அந்த அளவுக்கு அவர்கள், அந்த கட்சியின் அபிப்பிராயத்தையும், பொது மக்களுடைய அபிப்பிராயத்தையும் இங்கே பிரதிபலிக்கச் செய்கிறார்கள். ஒவ்வொரு இடத்திலே ஒவ்வொரு விதமாக கட்சியின் அபிப்பிராயத்தை பிரதிபலிக்கச் செய்கிறார்கள். அதுதான் அக்கட்சிக்காரர்களின் வழக்கம். பிரஜா சோஷியலிஸ்ட்டு கட்சி அப்படித்தான் செய்யும். அக்கட்சியைப் பற்றி அத்துடன் விட்டு விட்டு, காங்கிரஸ் கட்சிக்கு வருவோம். தற்போது காங்கிரசானது ஜனங்களிடையே, குரோத மனப்பான்மையை, விரோத மனப்பான்மையை தூண்டி விட்டுக் கொண்டிருக்கிறது. அதன் மிகப் பெரிய தலைவர், பண்டிட் ஜவஹர்லால் நேரு அவர்கள், ‘அகில இந்திய ஒற்றுமை வேண்டும், எல்லா மக்களிடையேயும் ஒற்றுமையைப் பலப்படுத்த வேண்டும் என்று கூறுகிறார்கள். ஆனால் மற்ற காங்கிரஸ்காரர்களால் லாம் இந்த ஒற்றுமையைக் குலைத்துக் கொண்டுதான் இருக்கிறார்கள். அகில இந்திய காங்கிரஸ் கமிட்டியில் கனம் மந்திரி காமராஜ் நாடார்,

[Sri P. Ramamurthi] [24th November 1955]

பணம்பள்ளி கோவிந்த மேனன், காங்கிரஸ் கமிட்டியின் காரியதரிசி கோவிந்த நாயர் ஆகிய இவர்கள் எல்லாம் அங்கத்தினர்கள். கனம் காமராஜர் அவர்கள், பணம்பள்ளி கோவிந்த மேனனையும், கோவிந்த நாயரையும் கூப்பிட்டு “நாம் இன்றைக்கு, இந்த ராஜ்யப் புனரமைப்பு விஷயத்திலே, ஜனங்களிடையே மனக் கசப்பு ஏற்படும்படி செய்யக் கூடாது, அப்படிச் செய்வதால் நாட்டின் ஒற்றுமை பாதிக்கப்படும், இந்த ராஜ்யப் புனரமைப்பை சுமுகமாக தீர்த்துக்கொள்வோம், ராஜ்யச் செல்வையை எப்படி நிர்ணயிப்பதென்பதை ஆலோசனை செய்வோம்”, என்று சொல்லி நாட்டிலே ஏன் ஒரு நல்ல சுமுகமான சூழ்நிலையை உண்டாக்கக்கூடாது? ஏன் அவர்களால் அப்படி சுமுகமாக எதையும் செய்ய முடியவில்லை? அதற்குப் பதிலாக என்ன நடக்கிறது? இந்த அசம்பிளிஸ்ட், இந்த ராஜ்யப் புனரமைப்பு தீர்மானத்தை நிறைவேற்றினால், அதை நானேக்கு அமுலாக்க முடியுமா? இங்கே தீர்மானம் நிறைவேற்றலாம். தேவிசுளம், பீர்மேடு தமிழ் நாட்டுடன் இருக்க வேண்டுமென்று பலத்த மெஜாரிட்டியுடன், தீர்மானம் நிறைவேற்றப்படலாம் அதே மாதிரி, கொச்சி, திருவாங்கூர் State Assembly-யிலும் தமிழ் நாட்டுடன் சேர்க்க வேண்டுமென்று கமிஷன், சிபார்சு செய்திருக்கும் தோவானை, கல்குளம் முதலிய ஐந்து தாலுக்காக்களையும் கேரள ராஜ்யத்துடனேயே இருக்க விட்டுவிட வேண்டுமென்று பலத்த மெஜாரிட்டி பலத்துடன் தீர்மானம் நிறைவேற்றலாம். தேவிசுளம் பீர்மேடு இவைகளாகக் கேரளாவுடன் இருக்க வேண்டுமென்று வற்புறுத்திக் கூறலாம். இரண்டு மந்திரி சபைகளும், காங்கிரஸ் மந்திரி சபைகள் தான். மத்திய அரசாங்கத்தைப் பற்றியோ காரியக்கமிட்டியைப் பற்றியோ நாட்டின் ஒற்றுமை பற்றியோ கவலைப்படாமல் இவ்வித தீர்மானங்கள் நிறைவேற்றினாலும் முடிவில் என்ன ஏற்படும்? காங்கிரஸ் காரியக்கமிட்டியானது யார் பலமாக கோஷம் போடுகிறார்கள், யார் அடிக்கடி எந்த கோரிக்கைக்காகப் பலமாக, சத்தம் போட்டுக் கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள், யார் பக்கம் பலம் அதிகமாக இருக்கிறது என்று தெரிந்து எதையும் செய்யமாட்டார்கள். யாருடைய செல்வாக்கு காரிய கமிட்டியில் அதிகமாக இருக்கிறதோ எந்த தனிப்பட்ட தலைவர்களுடைய நல்ல செல்வாக்கு அந்த காரியக் கமிட்டியில் இருக்கிறதோ அவர்களுக்குச் சாதகமாக இப் பிரச்சினை தீர்க்கப்பட்டு விடும். இந்த அசம்பிளிஸ்ட் கனம் சுப்பிரமணியம் அவர்கள் இப் பிரச்சினையின் பேரில் ஒரு நல்ல வக்கீல் வாதம் செய்வதாலோ அல்லது இப் பிரச்சினைக்கு ஆதரவாக பெரிய Advocate-General விவாதங்கள் நடத்துவதினாலோ இப் பிரச்சினை தீர்க்கப்பட்டு விடாது.

தற்போது இந்த ராஜ்யப் புனரமைப்பு விஷயமாக இத் தென்னாட்டில், இரு சாரர்களுக்கும் இடையே ஒரு பெரிய மனக் கசப்பை நடைமுறையில் பகைமை உண்டாக்கிவிட்டது. இதற்கு கம்யூனிஸ்ட் கட்சி என்ன செய்தது? இது விஷயமாக என்ன கேட்கிறார்கள் காங்கிரஸ்காரர்கள். (The Hon. Sri C. Subramaniam : I hope that the Communist Party will do the just thing.) இந்த ராஜ்யப் புனரமைப்பு விஷயமாக உங்களுக்கு நியாயமாகப் படுவது மலையாளிகளுக்கு அநியாய மென்று படுகிறது. மலையாளிகளுக்கு நியாயமாகப் படுவதை நீங்கள் அநியாய மென்று நினைக்கிறீர்கள். இப்படிப்பட்ட நிலைமை ஏற்பட்டதற்குக் காரணம் காங்கிரஸ் கட்சி அநுஷ்டிக்கும் கொள்கைதான். இந்த பிரச்சினையை அணுகுவதற்கு அடிப்படையான அளவுகோலை விட்டு விட்டு இந்த பிரச்சினையை சுமுகமாக தீர்க்க அஸ்திவாரமான காரியத்தை மனதில் கொண்டு செய்யாமல், நிதி மந்திரிகளும் சுப்பிரமணியம் அவர்களும், மற்ற காங்கிரஸ்காரர்களும் மேலும் மேலும் மனக் கசப்பை இருசாரரிடையே, அதிகரிக்கும்படியான நிலைமையைத்தான் உண்டாக்கிக் கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள். சுமுகமாகத் தீர்க்கும் மார்க்கத்தை அவர்கள் தேடவில்லை, அவர்களால் தேட முடியவில்லை.

கனம் சுப்பிரமணியம் அவர்கள் கம்யூனிஸ்ட்டு கட்சியைப் பார்த்து இதில் ஒரு நியாயமான முடிவுக்கு வரவேண்டுமென்று சொல்லுவதை

24th November 1955]

[Sri P. Ramamurthi]

வரவேற்கிறேன். இப்படிப்பட்ட விஷயத்தில் கம்யூனிஸ்டு கட்சிதான் நியாயமான கொள்கையை கடை பிடிக்கிறதென்பதை சீக்கிரமே காங்கிரஸ் காரர்கள் அறிவார்கள் ; உணர்வார்கள். ஆந்திர மாகாணப் பிரச்சினை வரும் காலத்தில் கம்யூனிஸ்டுக் கட்சி ஒன்றுதான் ஒன்று பட்டு இருந்தது. அந்த சமயத்தில் காங்கிரசுக்குள்ளேயே பிளவு இருந்தது. சென்னை நகர விஷயமாக கேள்வி எழுந்தபோது காங்கிரஸ் மெம்பர்களுிடையேயும், பிரஜா சோஷலிஸ்டு மெம்பர்களுிடையேயும் அபிப்பிராய பேதமும், பிளவும் இருந்தன. ஆனால் கம்யூனிஸ்டு கட்சி அங்கத்தினர் களுிடையே ஒன்றுபட்ட ஒரு நிர்ணயமான கொள்கை இருந்தது. பம்பாய் விஷயத்தில் குஜராத்தி, மகாராஷ்டிரர்களிடையே அபிப்பிராய பேதம் ஏற்பட்டு பல தகராறுகள் நடப்பதைப் பார்க்கிறோம். ஆனால் இது விஷயமாக கம்யூனிஸ்டுக் கட்சிதான் ஒரே கொள்கையை அனுஷ்டிக்கிறது. இது மட்டுமல்ல சிலோனிலுள்ள தமிழர்கள் பிரச்சினையை எடுத்துக் கொண்டாலும் அங்கேயுள்ள சகல கட்சிகளும் ஒரு பக்கம் இருந்து கொண்டு பலப் பலவிதமான கருத்துக்களை தெரிவிக்கிறார்கள். ஆனால் அங்கு கம்யூனிஸ்டு கட்சி ஒன்றுதான் தமிழர்களுக்கு சுய நிர்ணய உரிமை கொடுக்கவேண்டியதுதான் நியாயம் என்று ஒன்றுபட்ட கருத்துடன் ஒற்றுமையாக சொல்லுகிறது.

ஜனங்களை ஒருவருக்கொருவர் மனக்கசப்பு ஏற்படும்படி தூண்டிவிடுவது நியாயமல்ல. நான் இங்கு வர்க்கங்களை குறிப்பிடவில்லை என்பதை ஞாபகப்படுத்துகிறேன். ஜனங்களைத்தான் குறிப்பிடுகிறேன். தொழிலாளர்களுக்கும் முதலாளிகளுக்கும் போராட்டம் ஏற்பட்டால், நிலச்சவான்தாரர்களுக்கும் விவசாயிகளுக்கும் போராட்டம் நடந்தால், கணம் சுப்பிரமணியம் அவர்கள், அது விஷயமாக தொழிலாளர்களுக்கோ, விவசாயிகளுக்கோ ஒன்றும் செய்யமாட்டார்கள். முதலாளிகளுக்கும், நிலச்சவான்தாரர்களுக்கும் மனமாற்றம் ஏற்படவேண்டும் அப்போதுதான், தொழிலாளர்களுக்கும் விவசாயிகளுக்கும் சாதகமான சட்டம் செய்யமுடியுமென்று சொல்லுவார்கள். பெருமுதலாளிகள், நிலச்சவான்தார்கள் சம்பந்தப்பட்டவரையில் அந்தக் கொள்கை. ஆனால் ஜனங்கள், ஆந்திரர்கள், மலையாளிகள், கன்னடியர்கள், தமிழர்கள் இந்தாட்டில் இருக்கிறார்கள், ராஜ்யிய புனரமைப்பு விஷயமாக தகராறுகள் இருக்கின்றன. இருந்தாலும், இந்த ஜனங்கள் சம்பந்தப்பட்டமட்டில் அந்தக் கொள்கை வேண்டியதில்லை, அந்தக் கொள்கையை அனுசரிக்க மாட்டார்கள். ஒருவரை யொருவர் அடித்துக் கொள்ள வேண்டுமென்பதுதான் அவர்கள் கொள்கை.

பம்பாய் நகரத்தில் நடக்கும் போராட்டமானது, ராஜ்யங்கள் அமைக்கும் விஷயமான போராட்டமானது குஜராத்தி மக்களுக்கும் மகாராஷ்டிர மக்களுக்கும் நடக்கும் போராட்டமல்ல. பம்பாயை பெரும் முதலாளிகள் கையில் விட்டு விடுவது என்ற காங்கிரஸின் ஒரு பிற்போக்கான கொள்கையின் காரணமாகவே பெரும் முதலாளிகளுக்கும் தொழிலாள வர்க்கத்திற்கும் நடக்கும்படியான போராட்டமானது. அந்த கொள்கையினால் எஸ்.ஆர்.வி. ரிப்போர்டின் அடிப்படை, காங்கிரஸ் கமிட்டியும் அதைத்தான் தீர்மானித்திருக்கிறது. அது அல்ல இன்று பிரச்சினை. ஜனங்கள் சம்பந்தப்பட்டமட்டில் காங்கிரஸ் இம்மாதிரி ராஜ்யிய புனரமைப்பு விஷயத்தில் ஒருவரின் மேல் இன்னொருவரைத் தூண்டி விடுவது சரியல்ல என்பதே என்னுடைய, என் கட்சியினுடைய கருத்து. ஆகவே, நீங்கள், காங்கிரஸ்காரர்கள், சிருஷ்டித்து அனுஷ்டிக்கும் கொள்கையின் காரணமாக எழுந்திருக்கும் தகராறுகளையும் மனக்கசப்பையும், நாங்கள்—கம்யூனிஸ்டுகள்—சமாளித்து ஆகவேண்டியதாக இருக்கிறது. நீங்கள் அதை சமாளிக்க முடியாதென்பது திண்ணம். சமாளிக்கும் சக்தி இருந்திருந்தால், முன்பே நீங்கள் எல்லோரும் ஒற்றுமையாக, சமாதானமாக போய் இருப்பீர்கள். பணம் பள்ளி கோவிந்த மேனன் தற்போது பேசுவதுபோல் உங்களை எதிர்த்து கொண்டிருக்கமாட்டார்கள். நீங்களும் இப்படி இங்கே பேசிக் கொள்கொண்டு இருக்கமாட்டார்கள். ஒரே குரலில் பேசி இருப்பீர்கள். அப்படி பேசுவதற்கு விருப்பம் கிடையாது. அதற்கான ஒரு கொள்கையும் உங்களிடத்தில் கிடையாது. உங்கள் கட்சிகாரர்களை ஒற்றுமைப்படுத்தவும் முடியவில்லை

[Sri P. Ramamurthi]

[24th November 1955]

அப்படி பேசுவதற்கு வேண்டிய ஒரு திறமையும் கிடையாது. அதற்கு வேண்டிய கொள்கையும் கிடையாது. நீங்கள் அனுஷ்டிக்கும்படியான கொள்கையின் விளைவால் நாட்டில் மேலும் சீர்குலைவு ஏற்படுமேயல்லாது ஒற்றுமையை ஏற்படுத்த முடியாது. உங்களால் கட்சிக்குள்ளேயே ஒற்றுமையை ஏற்படுத்தமுடியவில்லை. அப்படிப்பட்ட நிலைமையில் எங்களை நியாயம் பேசச் சொல்லுகிறீர்கள். நாங்களும் நியாயம் சொல்லுகிறோம். என்ன நியாயம் சொல்லுகிறோம்? முதன் முதலில் ஜனங்களிடத்தில் இப்போது, இருக்கும்படியான மனக் கசப்பை போக்க உதவி செய்யவேண்டுமென்று சொல்லுகிறோம். எப்படிப் போக்குவது? இந்தப் பிரச்சினையை தீர்ப்பதில் காங்கிரஸ் மெலிடம் கடைசியில் எந்தப் பக்கத்தில் செல்வாக்கு அதிகமாக இருக்கிறது என்பதைப்பொருத்து நிர்ணயிக்கும்படி விட்டு விடுவதற்கு பதிலாக, மலையாள மக்களும் தமிழ்நாட்டு மக்களும் சேர்ந்து, மக்களுடைய ஒற்றுமையின் விளைவாக பிரச்சனைக்கு முடிவு காண வேண்டும். இது சாத்தியமில்லை என்று மற்ற கட்சிகள் அபிப்பிராயப் பட்டால். தமிழ் மக்களும் மலையாள மக்களும் வேருளவர்கள். ஒருவருக்கொருவர் சண்டை போடுபவர்கள் என்ற மனோபாவம் மற்ற கட்சிகளுக்கு இருக்கலாம். ஆனால் கம்யூனிஸ்டு கட்சிக்கு அப்படிப்பட்ட அபிப்பிராயம் கிடையாது. நாட்டில் இருக்கக்கூடிய பல்வேறு மொழிகளை பேசக்கூடிய மக்களிடையே ஒற்றுமையை ஏற்படுத்துவது சாத்தியம் என்று நாங்கள் கருதுகிறோம். அதை ஏற்படுத்துவது எப்படி? இன்றைக்கு மக்களிடையே இருக்கும்படியான மனக்கசப்பை தீர்த்துவிட்டு, இந்தப் பிரச்சினையை இப்போது அவர்கள் அணுகும் முறைக்கு பதிலாக, வேறு முறையில் அணுகவேண்டிய மனோபாவத்தை சிருஷ்டிக்க வேண்டுமென்று கூறுகிறோம். அதை சிருஷ்டிக்கத்தான் வழியும் சொல்லுகிறோம். தமிழ் நாட்டில் இருக்கக்கூடிய மக்களைப் பொறுத்த வரையில், நாம் இந்தப் பிரச்சினையை எப்படித் தீர்ப்பது? கிராமவாரியாக இருக்கும்படியான தமிழ் மக்களின் கணக்கை எடுத்துக் கொள்ளுவது அதே சமயத்தில் இன்றைக்கு ஜனங்களிடத்தில் ஏற்படக்கூடிய பீதிகள் இருக்கின்றனவே, அதாவது நம் ராஜ்யத்தின் பொருளாதாரம் என்ன ஆகிவிடுமோ, மற்ற விஷயங்கள் என்ன ஆகிவிடுமோ என்பது சம்பந்தமாக ஏற்பட்டிருக்கக்கூடிய பீதிகள் அவை நியாயமானது, மேலும் அவற்றைக் கிளப்பியது காங்கிரஸ் தான் என்பதை ஞாபகத்தில் வைத்துக்கொண்டு, அவற்றையும் கணக்கில் எடுத்துக்கொண்டு இந்தப் பிரச்சினையை தீர்ப்பது சாத்தியம். அந்த முறையிலே ஜனங்களை அணுகவேண்டும். இந்தக் கண்ணோட்டத்தால் மக்களிடையே ஒற்றுமையை ஏற்படுத்துவது நம் கடமை. அதே மாதிரி மலையாள மக்களிடத்திலும் economic life line, என்பது போன்ற பேச்சுக்களால் பிரயோஜனம் ஏற்படாது. தமிழர்கள் மெஜாரிட்டியாக வசிக்கும் பிரதேசம் அடங்கியிருக்கிறதா என்பதை கவனிக்கவேண்டும்; அதே சமயத்தில் நமக்கு பொருளாதார வசதி இருக்கின்றனவே அவைகளும் கைவிட்டு போகாமல் அதற்கு வேண்டிய வசதிகளை எப்படி தேடுவது என்பதையும் கணக்கில் எடுத்துக்கொண்டு பிரச்சினையை அணுகவேண்டும். இந்த முறையில் பிரச்சினையை அணுக மலையாள மக்களிடையே இப்போது இருக்கும்படியான மனோபாவத்தை மாற்றவேண்டும் என்று நாம் சொல்லுகிறோம். காங்கிரஸ்காரர்களை கேட்டுக்கொள்ளுகிறோம், இந்த பிரச்சினையை தீர்க்கவேண்டுமென்றால், இந்த இரண்டு விஷயத்தையும் கவனத்தில் வைத்துக்கொண்டு, மலையாள மக்களிடமும், தமிழ் மக்களிடமும் ஒற்றுமை மனோபாவத்தை உண்டாக்கவேண்டும். இப்படிப்பட்ட ஒற்றுமையை உண்டாக்க இங்கே இருக்கக்கூடிய சகல கட்சிகளும் உடன்படுவேண்டுமென்று கூறுகிறோம். தமிழ் நாடு காங்கிரஸ் கமிட்டியும், மலையாள பிரதேச காங்கிரஸ் கமிட்டியும் இரண்டுமாக சேர்ந்து இப்படிப்பட்ட மனோபாவத்தை உண்டாக்க முயற்சி செய்யட்டும். அப்படி அவர்கள் முயற்சி செய்யாமல் போனாலும், தமிழ் நாடு கம்யூனிஸ்டு கட்சியும், மலையாள கம்யூனிஸ்டு கட்சியும் இந்த மனோபாவத்தை உண்டாக்கச் செய்யும் முயற்சிகளுக்கு இடைஞ்சல்களாவது செய்யாதீர்கள் என்று கேட்டுக்கொள்ளுகிறோம். இன்றைக்கு நீங்கள் செய்யும் பிரசாரம் மக்களிடையே மனக்கசப்பை உண்டாக்கியிருக்கிறது. இருதரப்பு மக்களுக்கும் மனக்கசப்பு ஏற்படாமல் இருக்கக்கூடிய வகையில் இந்தப்

24th November 1955]

[Sri P. Ramamurthi]

பிரச்சினையைச் சுமுகமாகத் தீர்க்கவேண்டும். இரு தரப்பினருக்கும் நியாயம் பிறக்கக்கூடிய வகையில் தீர்க்கவேண்டுமென்பதில் அக்கறை இருக்குமே யானால், இப்படிப்பட்ட ஒற்றுமை மனோபாவத்தை உண்டாக்க நாட்டில் இருக்கக்கூடிய கட்சிகள் ஒன்றாகச் சேரவேண்டுமென்று நாங்கள் கூறுகிறோம். அப்படிச் செய்தால் பரஸ்பரம் விட்டுக்கொடுக்கும் மனோபாவம் ஏற்படும். அந்த காலக் கட்டத்தில் “எனக்கு,” “உனக்கு” என்ற எண்ணம் போய் அதற்கு பதிலாக தமிழ் மக்கள் வாழவேண்டும், தமிழ் மக்கள் வளரவேண்டும். கேரள மக்கள் வாழவேண்டும், கேரள மக்கள் வளரவேண்டும், இன்னும் எல்லோரும் வளர்ந்து இந்த நாடு வளர வேண்டும், எல்லோரும் ஒட்டிக்கொண்டிருக்கிற இந்த தேசம் வளர வேண்டுமென்ற புதிய மனோபாவம் வளர உதவிகரமாக இருக்கும்.

(At this stage, the Speaker resumed the Chair.)

அப்படிப்பட்ட முறையில் இன்றைக்கு பிரசாரம் செய்வதற்கு பதிலாக, வக்கீல் வாதத்தை கிளப்புவதால் இந்தப் பிரச்சினை தீர்க்கப்படப்போவ தில்லை, ஆகவே நான் கொடுத்திருக்கக்கூடிய திருத்தப்படி, இப்படிப் பட்ட மனோபாவத்தை உண்டாக்க சகல கட்சியும் உதவி செய்ய வேண்டும், அதே சமயத்தில் இந்த பிரிவினை பிரச்சினை நான் கூறிய அடிப்படையில் தீர்க்கப்படவேண்டுமென்பதுதான். கடைசியில் எந்த machinery ஏற்படுத்தப்பட்டாலும் சரி Boundary Commission ஏற்படுத்தப்படுகிறதா, அல்லது அரசாங்க ராஜ்யங்களே தங்களுக்குள் பேச்சு வார்த்தை மூலம் தீர்க்கப்போகிறதா என்பதைப்பற்றி அல்ல நம் கவலை, அது அல்ல நம் பிரச்சினை, ஆனால் அவற்றின் அடிப்படை என்ன என்பதுதான் பிரச்சினை. இந்த அடிப்படையில் தீர்த்தாவேண்டும் என்று திருத்தம் கொடுத்திருக்கிறேன். காங்கிரஸ்காரர்களுக்குச் சொல்ல விருப்புகிறேன். இஷ்டப்படி நீங்கள் வோட்டுப் போடலாம் என்று சொல்லி யிருப்பது, ஜனங்களிடத்தில் நாங்கள் இப்படி வோட்டுப்போட்டோம் என்று சொல்லுவதைத் தவிர, அதன் விளைவாக இந்தப் பிரச்சினை தீர்க்கப்படும் என்ற நம்பிக்கை உண்டா? இங்கிருக்கும் காங்கிரஸ் தலைவர்களுக்கோ, அல்லது அங்கத்தினர்களுக்கோ நிச்சயமாக அந்த நம்பிக்கை கிடையாது என்று சொல்ல ஆசைப்படுகிறேன். இந்தப் பிரச்சினை தீர்க்கப்படவேண்டு மென்றால், எப்படி அணுகுவது என்று புதிய முறையை வகுத்துக் கொள்ள நீங்கள் உதவி செய்யவேண்டுமென்று கேட்டுக்கொள்ளுவதுடன், நான் கொடுத்திருக்கும் திருத்தத்தையும் ஏற்றுக்கொள்ள வேண்டுமென்று கேட்டுக்கொள்ளுகிறேன். அதை ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளாமற் போனால், கம்யூனிஸ்ட் கட்சி சம்பந்தப்பட்ட மட்டில் எங்களது நிலை என்ன என்பதையும் சொல்லிவிடுகிறேன். நாங்கள் எங்கள் திருத்தத்தை வற்புறுத்துகிறோம். அது ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளப்படாத காலத்தில், ஸ்ரீ கருத்தி திருமன் கொடுத்திருக்கும் திருத்தத்தை, அதாவது பொதுவாக கேரள, கர்னாடக தமிழ் ராஜ்யங்கள் ஏற்படுத்தவேண்டும், அவசியமானால் இவற் றின் எல்லையில் சில மாறுதல்கள் செய்து ஏற்படுத்தவேண்டும் என்று கூறும் திருத்தத்தை, நாங்கள் நியாயமான திருத்தம் என்று கருது கிறோம். அதற்கு நாங்கள் ஆதரவு கொடுக்கிறோம். சென்னை ராஜ்யம் என்ற பெயரை தமிழகம் என்று மாற்றவேண்டும் என்ற திருத்தமும் நியாயமானது. அதில் யார்க்கும் ஆட்சேபனை இருக்கமுடியாது. அப்படி மாற்றுவதிலும் கஷ்டம் இருக்கும் என்று நான் நினைக்கவில்லை. ஆகவே அந்த திருத்தத்திற்கும் நாங்கள் ஆதரவு அளிக்கிறோம். பாக்கியிருக்கக் கூடிய திருத்தங்களில் மொழி வழி அம்சமே இல்லை. அவைகள் விவகாரத்தை வளர்க்கும்படியான திருத்தங்களைத் தவிர, விவகாரத்தை தீர்க்கப்போவதில்லை. ஆகவே அந்தத் திருத்தங்கள் சம்பந்தப்பட்ட மட்டில் கம்யூனிஸ்டுக் கட்சி வோட்டுப் போடப் போவதில்லை, சம்மா இருக்கப்போகி ரோம். எங்களுடைய திருத்தத்தை வற்புறுத்துகிறோம். அதை மற்றவர்களும் ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளவேண்டுமென்று மறுபடியும் கேட்டுக்கொள்ளுகிறேன். குறிப்பாக காங்கிரஸ் கட்சி தலைவர்களுக்கு நான் கூற விரும்புகிறேன். காங்கிரஸ் காரிய கமிட்டி அங்கத்தினரான ஸ்ரீ காமராஜ நாடார் இங்கே விருக்கிறார். அவரை நான் கேட்டுக்கொள்ளுகிறேன். விவகாரத்தை தீர்க்க

[24th November 1955]

12-20
p.m. SRI A. RATNAM : On a point of order, Sir. I have not been given an opportunity to speak. As explained to you in person in your Chamber, I request that I may be given time. As a mark of protest, I am walking out. (The hon. Member then walked out of the House.)

* **SRI O. KORAN:** മിസ്റ്റർ സ്പീക്കർ, സർ, ബഹുമാനപ്പെട്ട പ്രതിപക്ഷനേതാവ് പല കാര്യങ്ങളെപ്പറ്റിയും പറഞ്ഞു. എന്നാൽ അതിപ്രധാനമായ ഒരു കാര്യത്തെപ്പറ്റി അദ്ദേഹത്തിന്റെ പ്രതിപ്രായമെന്തെന്നറിഞ്ഞാൽ കൊള്ളാം. സംസ്ഥാനപുനഃസംഘടനാജ്ഞാർജ്ജനം റിപ്പോർട്ടിനെക്കുറിച്ച് ഇന്ത്യയിലെങ്ങും വളരെ യധികം പ്രക്ഷോഭങ്ങളും വാദപ്രതിവാദങ്ങളും നടന്നുകൊണ്ടിരിക്കുമ്പോൾ അവസാന സീക്കുമെന്റുകളടങ്ങുന്നതിന് പണ്ഡിറ്റ് നെഹറു അടങ്ങിയ ഒരു കമ്മിറ്റിയെ മാത്രമാണ് ചുമതലപ്പെടുത്തിയിട്ടുള്ളത്. ആ നടപടിയെപ്പറ്റി ബഹുമാനപ്പെട്ട പ്രതിപക്ഷനേതാവിന്റെ അഭിപ്രായമെന്തെന്നറിഞ്ഞാൽ കൊള്ളാം.

MR. SPEAKER: He wants the Leader of the Opposition to say whether he has got any opinion regarding the Committee that is formed by the Central Government.

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI : The Central Government has not formed any Committee. Only a sub-committee has been formed by the Congress High Command.

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am really happy at the high level of debate which we have maintained throughout. There were a few jarring notes but still the general level of the debate was high. We may congratulate ourselves that in spite of the fact that we have to put forward various points of view (not that we can have a regimented unanimity of opinion in respect of every question) it is possible even with that difference of opinion to work for unity and achieve unity. If it should be said that we will be achieving unity only by a regimented uniformity of thought and by a dead set of uniform principles which should be accepted by everybody, then life itself would become impossible as it is being realized by very many individuals who have been subscribing to this idea. Therefore, Sir, I am not

24th November 1955] [Sri C. Subramaniam]

unhappy that various points of view were expressed on the floor of this Assembly. But, having expressed various points of view, we have ultimately to arrive at a decision, a decision which would be just and fair to the various parts of the country and in that connexion I am really sorry that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition said that the ultimate decision would be only in favour of those who shout most or who have got a pull with certain persons in the High Command. I strongly protest against it. I wish we all have faith in the leaders of our country, whoever may be the leaders in charge of the affairs of the country. It is very easy to attribute motives that they are likely to be influenced by the regional considerations. If we develop that attitude, nothing will be possible. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition in his anxiety to attack the Congress Party, in his anxiety to undermine the faith of the people in the Congress leaders, has tried to bring about a situation which he wanted others to avoid. Therefore, Sir, the entire approach of the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, I am sorry to say, has been based merely from his party point of view. I will in the course of my speech try to illustrate how that has been the only approach he has attempted to make, how to bolster up his own party which is going down and down below a level which nobody expected. (Laughter.) When I was hearing the Leader of the Opposition, I was only reminded of a story of a seemingly religious person saying that he was a Vedanthi and therefore considered that everything was Maya. He committed a wrong act and when a person approached him and took him to task he said that everything was Maya and so what he did was also Maya. Therefore, Sir, we cannot forget hard realities. I know Ramamurthi's party principles. His only approach is what is best for his party. But, let him not put it on a higher pedestal than that that this is necessary for the unity of the country, that if there is any difference of opinion, it is likely to jeopardise the unity of the country. Our own ideal is, in spite of the various differences of opinion, in spite of the various languages, etc., it is possible to build up the unity of the country and it should be possible to build up the unity as even the hon. the Leader of the Opposition has tried to explain. We do want to have a united India and united people in spite of the differences of opinion, because we have faith in the unity of the country. Therefore, let us not put this unity of thought and unity of approach as a principle which should be accepted by everybody.

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI: I am glad that the Hon. Leader of the House has talked about their doing away with regimented thought and all that. If I wanted unity of action, I wished the Hon. Leader of the House allowed the same freedom of action to his party members when it comes to a question of a Land Bill or a Bill affecting workers and peasants.

*** THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:** Sir, what the hon. the Leader of the Opposition attempted to make is quite a different thing altogether. The point for consideration is this. We have come to the conclusion that there should be reorganization of the

[Sri C. Subramaniam] [24th November 1955]

various States. How best it should be done is the problem. And in that process, as I have already stated, there is bound to be a variety of opinion and we should give scope for the expression of that variety of opinion. After giving vent to those various points of view, it should be possible to come to an agreement either by mutual agreement or ultimately we may agree to abide by any arbitration. Therefore, I said that when we have to ultimately depend upon the decision of the leaders of the country, then an atmosphere should be created wherein it should be possible for the people to take those decisions and not again agitate for varying those decisions. In that process, I am afraid instead of helping the country, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition attempted to spoil, as far as possible, that atmosphere so much so it should be possible for the Communist Party to do propaganda that those decisions are wrong, that it should not be accepted, etc.

Then, Sir, as far as this reorganization is concerned, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition was at great pains to show that this has been the achievement of the Communist Party, the establishment of the Communist principle.

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI : I never said that this is the achievement of the Communist Party. I know that other democratic parties in the country have been with us. Even Congressmen have been with us in spite of what they could say against it. Many Congressmen have been with us on this question. This is the achievement of the democratic people of the country.

*** THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :** I know what is the meaning of "democracy" and "people" when it is used by the Communist Party. (Laughter.) I know what they mean.

Therefore, Sir, let us not go into that vexed question now. Let us see how we have to approach the present problem and arrive at a decision. Various points of view have been put forward and it is necessary to take note of those points of view and then ultimately arrive at a just and proper decision. Therefore instead of trying to evade the real issue under the guise of certain principles, let us face certain hard realities. Let me illustrate, Sir, by one point how the Communist Party seeks to evade the real point at issue. They say let us adopt the village as a unit and let us decide to which State it should go. It is a good principle, I agree. But, has any member of the Communist Party touched the question of Peermade and Devikulam in respect of population, Sir? Here is the Commission's report saying that this is a floating population, therefore, even though a majority of them in those places are Tamils, still it should be ignored because it is a floating population after all. Even the application of the principles depends upon how we decide about this. What is the opinion of the Communist Party about it? I know it is inconvenient for them to express any opinion about it. Sir, the important thing about which I laid great stress was that this floating population is an illusion.

24th November 1955] [Sri C. Subramaniam]

Therefore, Sir, it is easy to talk of principles when we are not able to face hard facts. It is the ideal of the Communist Party that their Party interests are higher than any other interest—even family interest (laughter), national interest and every other interest. Everything is ultimately subordinate to their party interest. Otherwise, they are not true Marxists . . .

12-30
P.M.

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI: Sir, I do not want to go into the whole question and define what is the ideal of the Communist Party, but I want to clarify one particular point. Throughout this debate, as far as the Communist Party is concerned, we took the decision with regard to actual facts and figures. These can be easily ascertained by the organization to be set up for this purpose, once we accept the principle.

As far as the question of floating population is concerned, we do not subscribe to the theory of 'floating population'. None of us touched that point. But we are concerned with facts and figures relating not only to Devikulam and Peermede taluks but also with regard to Palghat and other places. We must find out what population is here and what population is there. Let the Congress Party accept this principle. Once we accept it, it will be easy to settle the question as it is based on facts. Facts cannot be opposed by the majority of the House. Facts are going to remain there. Any machinery can be set up to go into them.

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM: I am glad to hear about it. Now, the machinery has been set up and facts have been ascertained with reference to Peermede and Devikulam. If, as the hon. Leader of the Opposition suggests, we have another enumeration, it is not going to lead us anywhere because in the present situation when passions have been roused, it will be very difficult to get at the correct figures. If it is merely a question of figures, here are the figures quoted in the 1951 Census Report. That census was taken not by the Madras Government but by the Central Government. With reference to Devikulam and Peermede, what do those figures show? According to that, except the village of Pallivasal in the Devikulam taluk and another village in the Peermede taluk, all the other villages contain a majority of Tamil population. Such being the case, why is he still talking of the principle only? According to that principle, as far as Devikulam and Peermede are concerned, the decision of the States Reorganization Commission is wrong. But the Communist Party is hiding that fact because of the fear of disruption within its ranks. That is why, they say: "Leave it at that. Accept the principle first and try to work it out later on." Here are their own principles. But here are the facts which they are not prepared to accept. With reference to Devikulam and Peermede, is the Communist Party prepared to accept these facts and vote accordingly because they go on principles and not merely on regional consideration? Will the Malayalee Communists now vote for Devikulam and Peermede being included in the Madras State? No, because that

[Sri C. Subramaniam] [24th November 1955]

will disrupt their party and for them party interest is paramount. That is why they say that they, as a party, would abstain from voting. Sir, I did not want to say anything about the Communist Party but unfortunately the hon. the Leader of the Opposition wanted to show that every party other than his own is not fit for the administration of the country and it is not fit for settling national issues but the Communist Party alone is competent to do it and it only has got the necessary ideals for doing justice to the various regions in the country. But I want to tell those people who have taken them at their word, that it is not so. Their party interest is the paramount consideration and it is that consideration which is in their mind that has led them to this "Maya". Here are the hard facts placed before the Communist Party. I want a decision from them. With all these facts and figures, are they prepared to accept the amendment that Devikulam and Peermade taluks should go to Tamil Nad and say that the decision of the States Reorganization Commission that they should go to Kerala is wrong? If they do so, I am prepared to consider their amendment. But they are not prepared to face hard facts placed before them which cannot be refuted. What is the use of hiding the facts and asking us to accept certain principles? It will really mean nothing if the principles are not applied to the facts. Therefore, I would respectfully submit to the hon. Leader of the Opposition that he should not try to evade the issue at this stage. After all, we are here to express our opinion. We are bound to put forward the various points of view. But the members of the Communist Party are even afraid to express those points of view simply because it will affect the unity of their party. That is why I am saying that their paramount consideration is not the interest of the country, their consideration is not what is just and proper but what would help their small party to get united. That is why they say that first we must accept their principles and then other solutions will be found. Solution will be found for the Communist Party but not for the various problems that are facing the country. Therefore, I would appeal to the hon. Leader of the Opposition that instead of trying to decry the leaders and create disaffection against the national leaders who will undoubtedly have to decide important issues, he should co-operate even though it might temporarily injure the interests of the Communist Party. He should accept the wisdom of the leaders even though they may belong to other parties and trust them and abide by the decision they may take. This is the attitude he must take in this matter and not merely talk of principles. Then alone we will be creating the necessary atmosphere in the country. After all, in the application of the principles, there are bound to be difficulties. There are bound to be border disputes, whether a certain area should go to this State or that State. Ultimately, we have to depend upon the decision of the third party, that is some person in whom we have confidence. Only if we create that atmosphere, we will be able to build up the unity of the country. But the Communists are only trying to create further difficulties by their attitude of distrust of our

24th November 1955] [Sri C. Subramaniam]

national leaders. They are trying to fish in troubled waters and that is what they are attempting to do. Sir, this attempt to fish in troubled waters may pay some times. They may get fish now and then but ultimately they will get drowned in the very process. That is the warning I want to give to the Communist Party.

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI : Sir, I do not want to go into all sorts of questions raised now as I have no opportunity to reply to them now. But I want to give an assurance on the floor of the House that whatever might be the decision arrived at on this matter, the main objective of the Communist Party was, is and will continue to be to see that the Malayalees and the Tamilians do not fight each other. It is towards this end that we will bend all our energies. Whatever may happen, we do not want people to fight each other.

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : If that is the objective of the Communist Party alone, then, is it his view that the Congress Party wants that Malayalees and Tamilians should fight or the Praja Socialist Party wants that the Malayalees and the Tamilians should fight or the Muslim League Party wants that the Malayalees and the Tamilians should fight. It is not so. Everybody wants peace. Ultimately everybody realizes that we have to live as good neighbours, whatever may be the ultimate decision. No Communist Party is necessary to preach that homily to the other parties. We know our own principles and ideals. We know what is in the best interests of the country and we want to see that Malayalees and Tamilians do not fight each other. But, Sir, language is a thing which is bound to give rise to passion. We cannot bottle it up by saying that no expression should be given to any feelings at all. Even in respect of territorial adjustments which is made within the Union, it gives rise to passions. We cannot ignore it. You cannot shut out those passions and say nobody should give expression to them. The best way of avoiding passion and giving rise to conflicts is to give an opportunity to it to express itself. The Leader of the Opposition and his party do not recognize any such freedom of speech. They know only one way and that way we are not prepared to adopt and that we will never adopt as far as we are concerned. Therefore, Sir, may I say with great respect, that we are unable to agree with the Opposition Leader in merely propounding the principles and be content with the principles ignoring all the hard facts before us. I have very great respect for Mr. Ramamurthi. As a matter of fact I wish he should become more and more tamed so that he can become an effective constitutional Opposition Leader here and become more and more useful in the administration of the country. He has become tamed to a certain extent but he must become tamed to the extent of subordinating the interests of his party to the interest of the nation as a whole. Unless that attitude comes to him, I have no doubt whatsoever that his role here as an Opposition Leader to that extent will be ineffective, even though I may personally attach very great importance to what he says and sometimes to what he does also.

[Sri C. Subramaniam] [24th November 1955]

Let us now take up the question of Peermede and Devikulam taluks. Mr. V. R. Krishna Ayyar was waxing eloquent that, after all, people should express themselves in their own language and was asking if Malayalee people who did not know Tamil language should be here, what was their position? I will ask the same question. Here is the majority Tamil population in Devikulam and Peermede taluks and this majority will naturally elect a Tamil representative. Is he to sit as a dummy in the Kerala Legislature without being able to express himself? That is one aspect we will have to consider.

There is another aspect also. After all why do they Malayalees want Peermede and Devikulam taluks? They say that there is over population. Then we can see what is their idea. Kerala is already overpopulated. It is not as if Devikulam was not available already. The influx of population is limited to a certain extent because it cannot hold more being largely an estate area. The population there cannot therefore increase. If it was possible to increase then certainly more people should have come into this area long ago. Therefore if they want to make use of these taluks for their increasing population the only way is by displacing the Tamilians already living there. Is that the intention of the Malabar people? Because they do not have much space to live in they want more space. Therefore do they want to displace the Tamilians? If that is the intention we cannot agree to it because the Tamil people have gone there and developed that area and are living there permanently now. Therefore, we have to take this fact into consideration, namely, what are their intentions in claiming Devikulam and Peermede taluks? Is the claim made on the basis that the Travancore-Cochin State is an over-populated country and therefore these taluks are required for finding place for their over-population? If that is so, this problem cannot be solved, unless the Tamilians living there are driven out and Malayalees occupy their place. Therefore, taking into consideration all these facts, I have absolutely no doubt that even in the interest of Tamilians living there it is necessary to take away those taluks from the Kerala State.

There is another reason also. There are bound to be linguistic minorities in every State even after the redistribution of States. As far as the Madras State is concerned I would like to give the picture after separation takes place. Even after separation, we will find that 24,700,000 Tamilians would be living in our State. Thirty-two lakhs of Telugu people will be with us here. Three lakhs Malayalees will also be with us along with about 800,000 Kannadigas. All these linguistic minorities will have to be given sufficient protection. We should see who is in a better position to give these linguistic minorities the necessary safeguards. I may say that Madras is the most fitted State for this because we have been a Composite State and we have given facilities for Malayalee students and Malayalee people here, for Telugu students and Telugu people and Kannada students and Kanarese people here.

24th November 1955] [Sri C. Subramaniam]

We have given them various facilities. If Telugu students want to study in their own language we have got accustomed to giving them facilities for that. Similarly if Malayalee students want to study in their own language, we have got accustomed to giving them facilities for that. So also is the case with regard to Kanarese people. We have got accustomed to that idea. This idea is alien to various other States. I ask why do the people of Kerala State want to create a new problem of looking after linguistic minorities for them particularly when they are pleading that they are economically and financially weak and why do they want to take over this burden of providing new and further facilities for a linguistic minority? In fact it will not be possible to give these facilities at all because however much we may provide constitutional protection after all the interests of majority will be paramount. We know their economy and they have to develop it. Therefore they will be giving all their thoughts to the economic development of their own area. I do not think we can provide financial or other resources to give protection to these linguistic minorities. Therefore if the facilities and the safeguards that should be given to them should be a reality it may be possible only in a place where people have become accustomed to the idea. Instead of creating more linguistic problems in a new-born State it should be left to a State which is accustomed to do it. This may result in a few more Malayalees coming into our State. But we are accustomed to tackling this problem. We are already tackling this problem. For tackling these problems, we need not take new steps. Therefore, the merging of Peermede and Devikulam in our State will not create new problems. They will be a problem to Kerala because they will have to take one and one-fourth lakhs of Tamils. We have got already three lakhs of Malayalees and the addition of 20,000 Malayalees will not create a new problem. We are already giving all facilities to Malayalees and from this point of view I would appeal to the hon. Members who would be going over to the future Kerala State to consider this aspect not merely as a question of land-grabbing but as a question of facing the human problem. It is not merely a question of taking over areas and estates but it is essentially a human problem which is more important than the land problem. If that is taken into consideration and if what I had already stated is also considered, I have, absolutely no doubt that they would realize that Devikulam and Peermede taluks would be a liability as far as human problems are concerned if they are tacked on to the Kerala State, and on the other hand, they will be solving a big problem by handing over the majority Tamil area to the Tamilians. I am sure this aspect would be taken into consideration, if in case we are unable to come to an agreement by mutual talks, by those who will be asked to arbitrate and give a final decision in the matter. Therefore, Sir, this is not merely a question of trying to grab any territory. It is the human problem that we have to consider, which is after all the ultimate thing that we have got to solve. If this problem has to be solved this is the only approach that I can think of. I have

[Sri C. Subramaniam] [24th November 1955]

no doubt that if we take this as a human problem the only possible solution and the only best solution which will not leave headaches for the future, according to me, is to hand over Peermede and Devikulam to the Tamil area. We do not want to take over any other area where Malayalees are in a majority. If there are certain villages, as for instance Pallivasal village in Peermede taluk which should go over to the Kerala, we do not stand in the way. I am prepared to stand by my principle with reference to every inch of territory and I do not want to adopt one principle here and another principle there. I am prepared to tackle the question of Malayalees who will be a linguistic minority in this State. We have the strength and we realise what is good for the Nation. Further it is not a question of taking over any new responsibility or new liabilities. That is why I am saying that if it will not be inconvenient and if it will not give rise to passions, let Gudalur remain with us; not that I want to apply a separate principle but because that is a problem which we are tackling now and which we are capable of tackling. We should look at things from the national point of view. But if you think that because you have got some Malayalam-speaking majority areas and therefore it should be taken over, we are prepared to consider it. But I am asking in their own interests and in the interests of the new Kerala State, not to take additional burdens which they won't be able to bear.

Then comes the question of economic viability.

SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR : Sir, may I know from the Hon. the Finance Minister whether he is aware of that great leader Sri E. V. Ramaswami Naicker's pronouncement about Devikulam and Peermede areas and whether he has got any answer to that?

*** THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :** Sir, I am not in the habit of going through his statements. I generally try to ignore them. I am not accustomed to his politics and statements. But I would like the hon. Member not to stick to one statement but to study all the statements issued by him and if any principle is acceptable, let him come to me and I shall consider it. What I am now concerned with is the problem of Gudalur and in considering that problem, naturally we have to consider the question of the entire Nilgiris district. I was rather amazed when the hon. Member Sri Ari Gowder put forward the plea that the Nilgiris district should go to the Karnataka State. I do not know on what basis he was pleading for the inclusion of that district in the Karnataka State. Is it only on the basis of his being able to talk in Kanarese or having imbibed the Kanarese culture? I do not know. Anyhow, I have got the figures here and I shall give them for his own benefit. He must know what the figures are before he talks about this. As far as the Nilgiris is concerned, the percentage of Tamil-speaking population is 38.2 and that of the Malayalam-speaking population is 13.3. The percentage of the Kanada-speaking population is 12.9. If in spite of this fact that there is

24th November 1955] [Sri C. Subramaniam]

a Tamil-speaking population constituting 38.2 per cent as against the Kanada-speaking population of 12.9 per cent, Sri Ari Gowder says that Nilgiris should be handed over to the Karnataka State, then that is really a paradox which I am unable to understand. Perhaps it may be that he was pleading on some other basis which he was not good enough to enlighten us. Even from the point of view of administrative convenience, it is already in the Madras State. Such being the case, I do not know on what basis he made that suggestion. Perhaps he wanted to amuse us all because we were all along taking of serious matters. That is why probably he made that suggestion in a light-hearted manner so that we may feel amused. If that is so, the suggestion is quite welcome. (Laughter.)

Then, we come to the Gudalur taluk about which much was said by the Communist Party. The total population there is 45,598 in an area of 279 square miles. The Tamilian population in that area is 34.4 per cent and the Malayalam-speaking population is 39.4 per cent. This is according to the 1951 census figures. (Sri K. P. Gopalan : It is not correct, Sir.) You may say that it is not correct. The same thing is said in respect of Neyyattinkara, Chittur and Palghat. But we have to accept some figures as the basis and we are bound to accept the 1951 census figures. In the 1951 census the enumeration of the various slips has been made by the Government of India and they have provided us these figures. It is easy for anyone to say that a particular figure is wrong. Let me ask, what is the correct figure according to the hon. Member.

SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP : Sir, when the question of the preparation of the voters' list came up for discussion, the Hon. Minister himself gave the figures as Malayalees 41 per cent and Tamilians 20 per cent.

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : Sir, that was the picture according to 1931 census and that was the figure available then. So far as the 1951 census was concerned, enumeration had to be made taking every slip. That figure is now available and I am giving the latest figures according to the 1951 census which is the basis for all these decisions. If the hon. Member says that the 1951 census itself is wrong, then that is quite a different matter altogether. But I am giving those figures and also the enumeration made on the basis of the 1951 census.

SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP : On a point of order, Sir. In the Census Report population figures are given separately for each language groups in respect of all districts talukwar. But in the case of the Nilgiris district alone, it is not so given. It is therefore impossible to calculate the figures in respect of Gudalur taluk from the Census Report.

[24th November 1955]

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : Sir, in the Census Report the linguistic picture is given only with reference to the districts, not with reference to taluks at all. So far as taluks and villages were concerned, the Government of India ordered that there should be enumeration by taking individual slips with reference to each village. We have got the figures not only with reference to each taluk but with reference to each village, now in Gudalur taluk.

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI : That has not been published.

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : That has been printed and I think it is available now. It is the publication of the Government of India and not our publication. As against the Malayalam-speaking population of 39.4 per cent, the remaining population in respect of which we have got the responsibility is 60.6 per cent. That is the picture which we get. Therefore, we have to consider from that aspect also. Even with reference to the Gudalur taluk, if a certain principle is accepted, it must apply to Devikulam and Peermede taluks. I do not want to stand in the way at all. But I am bound to point out that in respect of Gudalur, apart from the forest area which is adjoining the regular Tamil area, the other area will be a liability for any other State and as the Minister for Finance I will be only too glad if that area is taken over and administered by somebody else. But that is a question of financial liability. There is also the human problem. But I may assure the hon. Members belonging to the various regions—now that we have come to recognize the various regions—that as far as Madras is concerned, so long as we are responsible for the administration, we will continue and, I am sure, whoever comes and undertakes the responsibility of administration of this State, will continue to recognize the linguistic minorities and give all the safeguards for the proper functioning of the State. (Cheers.) That is an assurance which I would like to give on behalf of the Madras State. Nobody will have any grievance that these linguistic minorities are being oppressed or that sufficient opportunities are not given to them for the development of their culture. Though there is only one Kanarese district, we have awarded so many prizes for Kanarese books, when giving prizes to language books. Similarly, though there is only one Malayalam district, we are awarding as many prizes for Malayalam books as for Tamil books. We have been administering like that and we are accustomed to that mode of thinking. We do not think in terms of language. That is all I want to say. If we had begun to think in that sectarian way, do you think that so many Malayalees will be holding offices here? Certainly not. So hon. Members may rest assured that the linguistic minorities will be properly protected so far as the Madras State is concerned. The attempt should be that the same facilities and the same guarantees are given in the other States also. But only certain States can fulfil those obligations. Certain other States, in the very nature of things, cannot fulfil them. So far as the Kerala State is concerned, every hon. Member was arguing that

24th November 1955] [Sri C. Subramaniam]

it is a weak State, overpopulated and financially not viable and that we should help them in all ways. Should we add to their burden and make them incur additional expenditure for the purpose of meeting the requirements of these linguistic minorities? But sometimes we do not know what is best in our own interests and claim certain areas thinking that they will be an asset. Ultimately, if we think over it, it may prove to be a liability. I am only putting forth that aspect before hon. Members. I am sure they will be able to think for themselves and come to just conclusions. We should not be carried away by mere passion of grabbing this territory or that territory. After all, this is not a question of grabbing territories. That is the position with regard to Gudalur as far as I am concerned. If it is said that villages with a majority of Malayalam-speaking people should go to Kerala and villages with a majority of Tamil-speaking people should go to Tamilnad, we are prepared to accept that basis. It is not as if we are not prepared to accept it. I have got a map with me and I can say which villages will go to Kerala and which villages to Tamilnad on that basis. But we cannot apply one principle in one place and another principle in another place. I have advocated the retention of Gudalur taluk in Tamilnad because the human problem there can be effectively tackled by the Madras State.

SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP: Is it the view of the Hon. Minister that, if Devikulam, Peermade and Gudalur taluks form part of the Madras State, Kerala State will not have the problem of linguistic minorities?

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM: I am not saying that there will not be any problem of linguistic minority at all. But to the extent that two lakhs Tamilians go out to that extent, the difficulty will be minimised. If we cannot get rid of difficulties altogether, we should at least try to minimise them. That should be the approach of wise people.

* SRI H. B. ARI GOWDER: I am thankful to the Hon. Minister for asking me to clarify the position regarding the Kanarese and Tamil population. Let me enlighten him in the first place that Kanarese people including the Badagas who speak a dialect of Kanarese have been put down in the census report as Tamilians because they read and write Tamil in schools. That is how you are getting a higher proportion of Tamil population on the hills. I suppose it is clear. Taking the population on the basis of the language spoken at home, let me assure the Hon. Minister and this House that Kanarese-speaking people form the single largest group in the Nilgiris district. I am prepared to prove this. Next to them come the Tamilians, third probably the Telugus and fourth the Malayalees. If I understand the Hon. Minister correctly, I believe he is prepared to concede my point for merger with Karnataka, if I prove that Kanarese people are the single largest group on the hills. I hope he will bear that in mind.

[24th November 1955]

* **THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM** : About the Kollegal forest area, whatever principle is applicable to Shencottah forest area will apply here also. If it is possible to bifurcate the Shencottah forest, it should be possible to bifurcate the Kollegal forest. If it is said that the forest should go along with the administrative unit and along with the people in one place, it should not be said in respect of another place, it should go to the Kerala or Karnataka State. The same principle should apply to Shencottah forest and Kollegal forest.

As regards the Tamil areas of Palghat and Chittur taluks, I have already explained my position. If it is possible to adopt a smaller unit, as was advocated by Sri P. Ramamurthi, then perhaps it may be possible to find a solution. In the formulation of principles, we have to take into account not our problems only but the entire all-India set-up. If we adopt a principle, it should be capable of application in every area. That is why I am unable to accept the amendment of the Communist Party suggesting that village should be taken as the unit. If village is taken as the unit, it may not be possible to demarcate the boundaries at all in some places quickly. After all, we have pointed out what our view is and how the problem should be approached. It should be possible for the States to arrive at conclusions which, when put before the authorities, should be capable of acceptance. Coming to quick decisions and quick implementation of those decisions are absolutely essential, because no Government can continue to function for long in the atmosphere prevailing now in which no development work is possible. Once decisions are taken, they should not be open to further agitation. As has been pointed out in respect of Bellary, if settled matters can be unsettled by agitation, agitation will go on endlessly. When we have taken a decision, we should stand by it. After all we are not creating independent States and if any difficulties arise, they could be settled by negotiation between the concerned States.

As regards the portions of the amendment by the Communist Party referring to the democratic urge of the people, strength of popular demand and vested interests, they are all brought in for purposes of party propaganda and to show that the Communist Party alone is fighting against vested interests. Therefore, I am not prepared to accept them.

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI : If the Hon. Leader of the House is prepared to accept the other portions, I am agreeable to deleting these portions.

* **THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM** : We cannot accept even the other portions and we will have to oppose them.

1-10
p.m. With regard to the naming of the State, my own view is that it is too early to decide about it. I may assure the hon. Members that the Government have an open mind with regard to this question. I would request the hon. Members not to force the issue.

24th November 1955] [Sri C. Subramaniam]

If it is to be forced, we have taken no decisions about it and, therefore, we cannot accept a change now. Therefore, we will have to oppose the amendment if it is pressed. I would ask the hon. Members whether it is good to take an adverse vote on that point. It will not be good. Therefore, it may be left open. I may assure the hon. Members that when the time comes, we shall certainly call the other Party Leaders also who are interested in it, discuss about it and then arrive at an agreed solution, instead of trying to force the issue even now. After all, I am not saying that they should give up their point of view. I am only saying, 'Let us not take it up now. We shall take it up separately when all the other border issues are settled. When we know what the Madras State is, it will be easy enough to decide about the name of the State.' There are various points of view and all of them will have to be discussed. I do not want to give my opinion. If I am asked to give my points against it, I can give seriatim, a number of points. But that is not my intention at all because I do not want to close my mind with regard to this. Therefore, I would appeal to the hon. Members not to force the issue and get an adverse vote which means that it is binding on the Government and we cannot go behind that vote later on. Therefore, I would appeal to them not to press it but to keep it open. As far as the Government are concerned, I may assure the hon. Members that we shall keep an open mind. We shall discuss it with Party Leaders in the Assembly and then try to arrive at an agreed solution. That could be done when the Bill comes up for consideration. Perhaps, that may be the most appropriate occasion when we may have to say, "'Madras' shall be changed into 'Tamil Nad'". Or, we do not want any change; let 'Madras' be retained." When we are considering border questions and how the boundaries should be adjusted, let us not bring in another problem here about the naming of the State. That will be quite relevant only when we have decided what should be in the Schedule of States in the Constitution. Therefore, I would appeal to the hon. Members who have, particularly, strong views about it not to block that point by getting an adverse vote in the Assembly. It is in their own interests that that amendment should be withdrawn.

As far as the amendment of the hon. Member Sri Karuthiruman is concerned, the Government stand by that amendment and they are supporting it. So also, the amendment which recommends that the Arabian Sea Islands should be taken over by the Central Government; as has been pointed by the representative of that area, Sri Appu, only if the Central Government are made responsible for its administration, they can solve the various problems arising there. Therefore, we are supporting that amendment.

With regard to the question of Peermede and Devikulam, I know that there are differences of opinion. It cannot be made a Party question or even the Government cannot say that it should

[Sri C. Subramaniam]

[24th November 1955]

be decided in a particular way. Therefore, as far as Devikulam and Peermade are concerned, the Government are not taking any attitude. In that respect the Members are free to vote in any way they like. That does not mean that the unity of the Congress Party will be shattered. We are quite capable of being united in spite of this difference of opinion. It is only a weak Party that will collapse by a mere difference of opinion in respect of a point. We are a strong Party and because of that we are able to withstand differences of opinion even within our own Party. Therefore, let us not preach what is applicable to a small and weak Party should be made applicable to a large and strong Party. We are capable of standing on our own legs. We are capable of fighting every other organization in spite of the differences of opinion amongst us on these various small matters. As far as the higher ideal is concerned, we stand united. We have got that ideal to hold the unity of the Party. I would appeal to the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, small as his Party is, not to be worried about the interests of the Congress Party. We are large and strong enough not only to be united but to fight his own organization, the so-called fighting organization also. That is quite a different thing. Therefore, we have given freedom of voting so far as the question relating to Devikulam and Peermade is concerned. That is not going to disrupt the Congress Party. That is not going to disunite the Party.

Finally, I would like to tell all the hon. Members that in spite of all these expressions of opinion, we are bound to live inside India as one Nation. We are bound to live as neighbours. We may put forward our points of view with force. After all, if one wants to put forward a point of view, one should put it forward as strongly as possible. There is no use of being "luke-warm" in these things. Therefore, when I put forward a point of view, it does not mean that I have got hostility towards the Malayalee people. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition would want to say, 'You are fighting for Peermade and Devikulam. Therefore, you are an enemy of Malayalees. You have got feelings of hostility to the people of Malabar'. Far from it, the hon. Member Sri Kolkebal pointed out that I functioned in the Constituent Assembly, then in the composite State and then now in the present composite State and that I was going to function as Minister in a smaller State. As far as functioning as a Minister is concerned, my area of jurisdiction may be shrinking, but as far as my vision is concerned, it is extending. I have got a much better perspective of the entire India. In my view, it is only by the development of all the regions of India that we can become strong. After all, the strength of the chain is in the strength of the weakest link in it. So also, my own view is that there should not be compartmentalized prosperity; there should not be isolated prosperity. All the regions should be properly developed and all people should be happy and prosperous. That is my ideal. It is for that purpose that we are working. What we are now

24th November 1955] [Sri C. Subramaniam]

doing is to have administrative arrangements whereby it would be possible to achieve these objectives. From that point of view, even though we may be functioning as separate States, I may assure the hon. Members, we will be functioning as good neighbours and whatever help is necessary from us will always be available to the Karnataka State and to the Kerala State. In this connection, I would also like to assure the hon. Members belonging to Malabar and to the Travancore-Cochin State that when we want to divert some of the waters from the Western Ghats to the Tamil Nad area, it is not to the prejudice of the Travancore-Cochin State at all, not to the prejudice of the Western regions at all. We say 'If there is any water available which is declared to be surplus after expert investigation, then let it not go waste. Let it be utilised for the national benefit'. Therefore, when I say that the waters of the Western Ghats may be diverted to Tamil Nad, I am not saying that it should be done at the cost of, or to the prejudice of, the Travancore-Cochin State. We want an expert examination whether the waters which are now going into the sea cannot be diverted here. If, after expert investigation, it is found that the water is surplus, let it be diverted to this area so that it may be for the mutual benefit of all. After all, it would be utilized not only for the benefit of the Tamil area but for the mutual benefit of the Travancore people and the Tamil people. That is my approach to the problem. Therefore, when I say that the waters may be diverted to this area, it is not for the sole benefit of this area but it is for the mutual benefit of both the areas. As far as I can see, these waters should be utilised for the benefit of both the States by generating power, for irrigation purposes and sharing the profits of all the facilities available. I am approaching the problem only from this point of view. Let nobody go with the impression, 'Here is a Tamilian who is trying to take away the waters belonging to others'. There is no question of Tamilian and Malayalee here. Here are the natural resources available and the only question is how best to utilise those resources. After all, India is one and the natural resources are the resources belonging to the whole of India. They should be utilized to the best advantage possible so that the entire country may prosper. If we approach the problems from this point of view even after separation, I have absolutely no doubt that Kerala can prosper, Tamilians can prosper, Karnatakas can prosper and the Andhras can prosper. India can then prosper and it may work for the unity of the entire humanity so that we may live in peace and happiness.

SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP : The question of diversion of the waters of the Travancore-Cochin State has played a considerable part in the debate. So far as I have been able to ascertain, there has not been any flat refusal to grant any surplus water that may be available. I have also perused very carefully the statement of the Travancore-Cochin State leaders. Therefore, I am one with the Hon. the Leader of the House that the waters

[Sri M. Narayana Kurup] [24th November 1955]

must be utilized for the benefit of both the States and if at all we are again in Kerala and if any toning down of the temperament of the Travancore-Cochin State leaders is necessary, I, on the floor of the House, give him that assurance.

* THE HON. SRI SUBRAMANIAM: I had never any doubt about the declarations made by those who are in authority now. But certain other persons who do not know the actual facts have come into the picture and have made all sorts of statements, which is likely to complicate the situation. That is why I am not accusing those who are in authority who have made certain statements. I have perused their statements. They are quite innocuous statements. I know their statement is possible of the construction that the water could be utilised to the best advantage of both the States. But, unfortunately, certain others have come into the picture and have made declarations saying that not an ounce of water should go out of their State. I am only referring to them so that even those people may feel rest assured that there is no question of any prejudice being caused to the Western regions.

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI: The Hon. the Leader of the House, referring to the forest area in the Kollegal taluk stated, 'What applies to the Shenkottah taluk must be applied here also'. I understand that there are some interested parties who are raising the question that the Shenkottah forest area must go to the Kerala State. Am I to understand from this statement of the Hon. the Finance Minister that the demand put forward for the inclusion of the forest area of Kollegal taluk in Tamil Nad by the Madras Government is not based on merits but is only put forward as a counteraction to the demand made by certain other people? If it is decided ultimately that the Shenkottah forest area should go to the Kerala State, am I to understand that the same principle must be applied to the Kollegal forest area also? I do not know what exactly is the implication of his statement.

1-20
P.M.

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM: Sir, the implication is this. What my hon. Friend the Leader of the Opposition wanted is that one principle should not be applied to one area and another principle to another area. That is all. Therefore, as far as this area is concerned, it is not a question of population of people. It is a forest area and there is no question of forests having any language. Therefore from that aspect, we put forward that view. But, now the Shenkottah area has been allotted to us. If by any chance any different view-point should be taken, we are saying that Kollegal forest should be retained in Madras. That is the only view which the Government take.

MR. SPEAKER: Now, the general discussion on the report of the States Reorganization Commission is closed. I shall proceed to put the amendments to the vote of the House. I would like to know from the Hon. the Leader of the House whether it would be possible to finish them by 1-30 p.m. to-day and, if not, whether they can be taken up to-morrow.

24th November 1955]

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : We shall sit till 2 o'clock and dispose of the amendments.

MR. SPEAKER : Twenty-three amendments have been given notice of, of which many amendments overlap one another. One amendment is for completely rejecting the Report of the States Reorganization Commission and the other is for the general approval of the report subject to border adjustments. Regarding border adjustments, there are several amendments relating to the Devikulam, Peermede, southern taluks of Travancore, Gudalur, Kasaragod, Kollegal, Chittoor, Hosur and the Nilgiris. There are also amendments regarding the naming of the State and about islands. I put the first amendment relating to the complete rejection of the Report given notice of by the hon. Member Dr. K. B. Menon. He is not in his seat. So, under rule 72 (2) of the Assembly Rules, if at the time of putting the question on a motion to the vote of the House, the mover of the motion is absent, it shall be considered to have been withdrawn by him, unless any member of the House asks that the question on the motion be put. Is any hon. Member pressing the amendment?

SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP : I press that amendment, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER : Then, that will be the first amendment for the rejection of the Report, that is, Amendment No. 21. I shall put the amendment to the vote of the House. The question is—

“Add the following at the end :—

‘and on such consideration this House rejects the same.’”

The amendment was put and lost.

MR. SPEAKER : The next amendment is No. 19 moved by Mr. P. G. Karuthiruman. The question is—

“Add at the end the following :—

‘and on such consideration this House accords its general approval to the proposals of the States Reorganization Commission to form a Kerala State and a Karnataka State with such border adjustments as may be found necessary.’”

The amendment was put and carried.

MR. SPEAKER : Next, I shall put to the vote of the House the amendment No. 23 of Sri P. Ramamurthi (which is a long one). The question is—

“Add at the end the following :—

‘and on such consideration this House is of the opinion that,

(a) the recommendation for the abolition of the distinction between Part A, B and C States as well as the institution of Raj-pramukhs is in accord with the democratic urge of the people;

[Mr. Speaker] [24th November 1955]

(b) the fact that despite the laborious arguments built up by the Commission against the formation of linguistic States, it had recommended fourteen out of the sixteen States to be formed on the basis of language is a demonstration of the strength of the popular demand;

(c) its recommendations to the contrary in respect of Bombay as well as Punjab were not guided even by any of the arguments it had adduced against the formation of linguistic States and that in the case of Bombay considerations for protection of the vested interests of the big business was its guiding factor;

(d) in the fixation of boundaries between various States, the Commission has not based its recommendations on any democratic principle but followed the opportunistic method of what it itself describes as that of "checks and balances";

(e) as a result, the unity forged between the different people speaking different languages in our country both during the struggle for independence and during the struggle for the formation of linguistic States is seriously threatened with disruption.

This House is further of the opinion that there is nothing sacrosanct about the districts or taluks which were purely administrative units created by the British Government, and for the fixation of boundaries this House recommends the following basis :—

(a) the village should be taken as the unit;

(b) villages having a majority population of a particular language group and lying contiguous to a State of the same language should be incorporated in that State.

In view of the bitter controversies that have arisen in relation to Peermade and Devicolam taluks and in view of the fact that passions of the Malayalee and the Tamil people have been inflamed, this House appeals to both the people and Political Parties of both Kerala and Tamilnad to approach this problem on the basis of the abovementioned principles and on the basis of respecting the mutual interests of both the people.

This House therefore recommends that this question of boundary line should be settled on the following basis :—

(a) the village should be taken as a unit;

(b) isolated pockets should be avoided; and

(c) due consideration should be given to the utilization of the waters in this area for the purpose of irrigation and power in Kerala and the revenue that the Travancore-Cochin State is getting from this area.' "

The amendment was put and lost.

24th November 1955]

MR. SPEAKER : I shall now put the amendment of Sri R. V. Swaminathan (Amendment No. 20) to the vote of the House. The question is—

“ Add at the end the following :—

‘ and on such consideration this House is of the view, that the areas of Devikulam and Peermede which form an integral part of Tamil Nad, contiguous to the Tamil areas with a large Tamil majority should also be transferred to the Madras State subject to such border adjustments as may be found necessary.’ ”

The amendment was put and the House divided thus :—

1-30
p.m.

Ayes—122.

The Hon. Sri K. Kamaraj.	Sri A. Iyanar.
„ C. Subramaniam.	„ V. Muthu.
„ A. B. Shetty.	„ A. S. Subbaraj.
„ M. A. Manickavelu.	„ S. Thinakarasaami Thevar.
Sri K. Rajaram Naidu.	„ V. Chinnayya.
„ B. Bhakthavatsalu Naidu.	„ T. V. Sannasi.
„ P. G. Karuthiruman.	„ N. Rajagopal.
„ V. C. Palaniswami Gounder.	„ R. M. Palaniappan.
„ B. K. Nallaswami.	„ A. M. Ratnaswami.
„ S. C. Virupakshiah.	„ C. Muthiah Pillai.
„ V. K. Palaniswami Gounder.	„ O. Chengam Pillai.
„ P. K. Thirumurthy.	„ Mohamed Salih Maraiçair.
„ R. Kuppuswamy.	„ M. C. Muthukumaraswami.
„ N. Mounaguruswami Naidu.	„ L. Anandan.
„ S. R. Arumugam.	„ V. Krishnaswami Padayachi.
Dr. P. Varadarajulu Naidu.	„ G. Vagheesam Pillai.
Sri S. Lakshmana Gounder.	„ A. S. Sahajananda.
„ P. G. Manickam.	„ K. Parthasarathy.
„ M. S. Selvarajan.	„ M. Jagannathan.
„ R. Krishnaswami Gopalar.	„ P. S. Krishnaswami Ayyanger.
The Hon. Sri R. Shanmuga Rajeswara Sethupathi.	„ G. Govindan.
Sri N. Ramakrishna Ayyar.	„ Ar. A. Rm. Chockalingam Chettiar.
„ K. Venkataswami Naidu.	„ M. Kandaswami Padayachi.
Dr. U. Krishna Rao.	„ R. Krishnaswami Naidu.
Sri M. R. Ramachandran.	„ P. Chellathurai.
„ T. P. Elumalai.	„ K. Shanmugam.
„ V. K. Ramaswami Mudaliar.	„ R. V. Swaminathan.
„ S. Panchaksharam.	„ P. Urkavalan.
„ H. M. Jagannatham.	„ T. Ganapathy.
„ R. Thangavelu.	„ V. Venugopala Krishnaswami.
„ A. Ramachandra Reddiar.	„ A. Vaikuntam.
„ M. P. Periaswamy.	„ R. S. Arumugam.
„ A. Sambasivam.	„ V. Arumugam.
„ P. M. Munuswamy Gounder.	„ P. B. K. Raja Chidambaram.
„ O. A. Nanjappa.	„ P. Selvaraj.
„ V. Govindaswami Naidu.	„ S. N. Somayajulu.
„ M. Dharmalingam.	„ I. K. Subramania Pillai.
„ N. Paramasiva Udayar.	„ Y. Manjaya Shetty.
The Hon. Sri B. Parameswaran.	„ K. Venkatramana Gowda.
„ S. S. Ramasamy Pada- yachi.	„ K. Ishwara.
Dr. Srimathi T. S. Soundaram Rama- chandran.	„ M. S. Mogral.
Sri T. K. Rama.	„ B. Vaikunta Baliga.
„ M. S. Muniswami Pillai.	„ L. C. Pais.
„ V. S. Chinnaswamy Naidu.	„ T. Ananta Pai.
„ S. Chinnakaruppa Thevar.	„ K. H. Bomman.
„ V. S. Sivaprakasam.	„ G. Samia Koorayar.
	„ W. J. Fernandez.
	„ K. G. Palaniswami Gounder.

[24th November 1955]

Ayes—122—cont.

Sri K. Aranganathan.	Sri N. Rathina Gounder.
„ A. Muthuswami.	„ K. R. Sambandam.
„ M. Kattimuthu.	„ P. Rathinaswami Pillai.
„ T. Menavalan.	„ T. Shanmugam.
„ S. Radhakrishnan.	„ A. Govindaswamy Nayagar.
„ M. Palanimuthu.	„ P. Kandaswami Gounder.
„ S. Kandaswami Gounder.	„ A. K. Hanumantharaya Gounder.
„ T. D. Muthukumaraswami Naidu.	„ M. Kandaswami Kander.
„ K. R. Viswanathan.	„ A. Veloo.
„ V. Balakrishnan.	„ R. Rangaswami Gounder.
„ H. B. Ari Gowder.	„ M. Palaniyandi.
„ S. Swayamprakasam.	„ K. Gajapathi Reddi.
„ K. Vinayakam.	„ S. T. Adityan.
„ S. Daivasigamoney.	„ M. Manickasundaram.

Noes—18.

1-40 p.m. Sri K. P. Kuttikrishnan Nair.	Sri C. Kunhirama Kurup.
„ E. K. Sankara Varma Raja.	„ V. Sankaranarayana Menon.
„ A. Appu.	„ M. K. Padmaprabha Gounder.
„ K. Uppi.	„ M. Nsrayana Nambiar.
„ C. Ahmed Kutty.	„ P. Kunhirama Kidav.
„ M. Chadayan.	„ O. Koran.
„ K. Kunhi Mohamed Shafee.	„ K. Moidu.
„ M. Narayana Kurup.	„ C. Velukkan.
„ K. T. Sridharan.	„ V. R. Krishna Ayyar.

Neutrals (abstainers)—13.

Sri S. S. Kolkebal.	Sri V. Madanagopal.
„ P. Ramamurthi.	„ K. V. Ramaswami.
„ M. Kalyanasundaram.	„ N. Sivaraaj.
„ K. P. Gopalan.	„ N. K. Palaniswami.
„ T. C. Narayanan Nambiar.	„ E. T. Kunhan.
„ P. Jeevanandam.	„ C. H. Kanaran.
„ S. Ramalingam.	

(At this stage two hon. Members belonging to the Communist Party and who had not voted for or against did not stand up and the attention of the Chair was invited to it.)

MR. SPEAKER: According to our Parliamentary practice the expression, “neutral” means those who abstain from voting.

SRI M. PALANIYANDI: On a point of order, Sir. Sri Gopalakrishnan did not stand up when the Chair called the neutrals to stand.

SRI K. KUNHI MOHAMED SHAFEE: On a point of order, Sir. Can the Members remain in their seats without voting for either “Ayes” or “Noes” or “Neutrals”? Is there any provision in the Rules for doing so?

MR. SPEAKER: This is a democratic body and we have absolute freedom of expression, to vote or to abstain from voting or to be in the House, without participating in the voting. Therefore, we cannot compel anyone to vote this way or that way. He may remain neutral or he may not do anything at all. It is not proper to question his action.

SRI K. VINAYAKAM: Under what category do they come?

SRI K. KUNHI MOHAMED SHAFEE: On a point of order, Sir. When the Chair has asked all the neutrals to stand up, is it fair to this House or the Chair for some Members to remain in their seats?

24th November 1955]

MR. SPEAKER: The question of being fair to the Chair or to the House is entirely different from a point of order. I cannot, as Speaker, compel a person to vote this way or that way or stand up or sit down. It is entirely within the competence of the individual Member to do what he likes. If he does not vote or does not say that he is neutral, it will be regarded that he is absent. So, there is no point of order.

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM: Sir, may I explain the position. A member can vote for "Ayes" or "Noes" or be "Neutral". When the Chair has called all the "Neutrals" to stand up, hon. Members are bound to obey the direction of the Chair. So, it is not a question of either voting or not voting but it is a question of obeying the direction of the Chair. But I would request hon. Members not to press their points of view now as we know the number of Members who have participated in the voting and those who have not

MR. SPEAKER: I find that in some Legislatures, the expression "abstainers from voting" is used but here the expression "Neutrals" is used.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM: "Neutrals" mean those who have abstained from voting.

MR. SPEAKER: After totalling the number of "Ayes" and "Noes" and the "Neutrals" we can find out who are the remaining Members who do not vote and they will be regarded as "absent".

SRI K. KUNHI MOHAMED SHAFEE: On a point of information, Sir. I want a clarification from the Chair whether those Members who remained in their seats without voting can be taken as "neutrals" or as "non-participants"? Can they disobey the orders of the Chair and be disloyal to the House? Also, whether this matter can be published in the Press just for the information of the general public who have sent us here and it is essential that the public should know what has happened now?

MR. SPEAKER: I think this matter has been sufficiently explained by the Leader of the House. Mistakes can always be rectified. Now may I request Mr. Gopalakrishnan also to stand up so that his name may be included among the "neutrals".

SRI P. K. GOPALAKRISHNAN: On a point of personal explanation, Sir. When those who were for the amendment were asked to stand up, so many Members stood up. When those who were against it were asked to stand up, so many other Members stood up. When the neutrals were asked to stand up, some hon. Members stood up. But we are neither for nor against the amendment and we are not also neutrals. (Laughter.) At the same time, let me explain my position. Our Leader had made it clear that we were abstaining from voting. If the Chair had asked us as to who were abstaining from voting, we would have stood up but that question was not put and we did not stand up.

[24th November 1955]

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI : Sir, evidently there seemed to be some misapprehension whether the word " neutrals " meant " abstainers from voting ". After all, it means the same thing and that has been made clear.

SRI S. DAIVASIGAMONEY : On a point of order, Sir. We can count only those who have voted for the amendment and against it and those who have remained neutral. But how are we going to count those who have remained without voting, that is, abstained from voting?

MR. SPEAKER : It is not a thing which one can compel. When the Chair has asked the neutrals to stand up, they have to do so but we cannot force anybody to do so. Abstaining from voting is not wrong. Now let me make the position clear. In this House, we have been using the expression " neutrals ". It means abstainers. Therefore, the expression " neutrals " was used. As certain hon. Members feel that those hon. Members who remained in their seats without voting should stand up, I request all those hon. Members who have abstained from voting to stand up please.

(Then the hon. Members Sri P. K. Gopalakrishnan and Sri K. C. Gopalan Unni also stood up in their seats and their names were then marked as " neutrals " along with—

- 1 Sri S. S. Kolkebail
- 2 Sri P. Ramamurthi
- 3 Sri M. Kalyanasundaram
- 4 Sri K. P. Gopalan
- 5 Sri T. C. Narayanan Nambiar
- 6 Sri P. Jeevanandam
- 7 Sri S. Ramalingam
- 8 Sri V. Madanagopal
- 9 Sri K. V. Ramaswami
- 10 Sri E. T. Kunhan
- 11 Sri N. Sivaraj
- 12 Sri N. K. Palaniswami
- 13 Sri C. H. Kanaran (making the number 15).

Ayes—122; Noes—18; Neutrals (abstainers)—15.

The amendment was carried.

MR. SPEAKER : The other amendments—amendment moved by hon. Member Sri S. Swayamprakasam, amendment moved by hon. Member Sri A. Ratnam and amendment moved by hon. Member Sri K. Vinayakam—relate to Devikulam and Peermede taluks and as we have already passed the amendment moved by hon. Member Sri R. V. Swaminathan these amendments cannot be put to vote again.

SRI S. SWAYAMPRAKASAM : The Hon. Speaker was pleased to say that my amendment need not be put to vote as a similar amendment had already been passed. My amendment is slightly

24th November 1955] [Sri S. Swayamprakasam]

different from the one already passed. My amendment does not contain the proviso mentioned in the amendment of hon. Member Sri R. V. Swaminathan which has been passed. In view of the fact that the amendment of hon. Member Sri R. V. Swaminathan has been passed I am prepared to withdraw my amendment. But that cannot be a ground for not putting my amendment to vote.

MR. SPEAKER : Is the hon. Member withdrawing his amendment?

SRI S. SWAYAMPRAKASAM : In view of the amendment of hon. Member Sri R. V. Swaminathan being carried by a majority and in view also of the stand taken up by the Hon. Leader of the House that when the problem is considered the 1951 Census figures will be looked into I am withdrawing my amendment.

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. SPEAKER : May I know whether the hon. Member Sri K. P. Gopalan is withdrawing his amendment?

SRI K. P. GOPALAN : In view of the fact that the question of Gudalur has been referred to in the amendment moved by hon. Member Sri P. Ramamurthi, I am not pressing my amendment.

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. SPEAKER : I will now take up amendments Nos. 8 and 9. Amendment No. 8 has been moved by hon. Member Sri K. Uppi Sahib and amendment No. 9 has been moved by Sri K. Kunhi Mohamed Shafee. There is no difference between amendment No. 8 and amendment No. 9. Therefore I will put amendment No. 8 to the vote of the House.

SRI K. UPPI : I am pressing my amendment.

MR. SPEAKER : I was saying that amendments Nos. 8 and 9 were the same and therefore I would be putting amendment No. 8 and the result of voting would be binding on amendment No. 9 also.

SRI V. R. KRISHNA AYYAR : On a point of information, Sir. The amendment which is now before us has got two parts. One part refers to Gudalur and the other part refers to five taluks in Travancore-Cochin State. May I know whether there is any direction with regard to voting one portion in one way and the other portion in another way?

MR. SPEAKER : The amendment cannot be split up. I am now putting amendment No. 8 (the amendment of the hon. Member Sri K. Uppi Sahib) to the vote of the House. The question is—

“ Add at the end the following :—

‘ and on such consideration this House approves of the principles underlying the proposed reorganization of States generally as recommended by the Commission ; but is of opinion that

[Mr. Speaker]

[24th November 1955]

the five southern taluks of Travancore-Cochin State and Gudalur taluk of Nilgiris district which are recommended by the Commission to form part of the reorganized Madras State, should be part of the Kerala State to be formed.' "

The amendment was put and the House divided thus :—

Ayes—17.

Sri K. P. Kuttikrishnan Nair.
" E. K. Sankara Varma Raja.
" A. Appu.
" K. Uppl.
" C. Ahmed Kutty.
" M. Chadayan.
" K. Kunhi Mohamed Shafes.
" M. Narayana Kurup.
" K. T. Sridharan.

Sri C. Kunhirama Kurup.
" V. Sankaranarayana Menon.
" M. K. Padmaprabha Gounder.
" M. Narayanan Nambiar.
" P. Kunhirama Kidav.
" O. Koraa.
" K. Moidu.
" C. Velukkan.

Noes—118.

2-00 The Hon. Sri K. Kamaraj.
p.m. " C. Subramaniam.
" A. B. Shetty.
" M. A. Manickavelu.

Sri K. Rajaram Naidu.
" B. Bhakthavatsalu Naidu.
" P. G. Karuthiruman.
" V. C. Palaniswamy Gounder.
" B. K. Nallaswami.
" S. C. Virupakshiah.
" V. K. Palanisami Gounder.
" P. K. Thirumurthy.
" R. Kuppuswami.
" N. Mounaguruswamy Naidu.
" S. R. Arumugham.

Dr. P. Varadarajulu Naidu.
Sri S. Lakshmana Gounder.

" P. G. Manickam.
" M. S. Selvaraj.
" R. Krishnaswamy Gopalar.

The Hon. Sri R. Shanmuga Rajeswara
Sethupathy.

Sri N. Ramakrishna Ayyar.
" K. Venkataswami Naidu.

Dr. U. Krishna Rao.

Sri M. R. Ramachandran.
" T. P. Elumalai.
" V. K. Ramaswami Mudaliar.
" S. Panchaksharam.
" H. M. Jagannathan.
" R. Thangavelu.
" A. Ramachandra Reddiar.
" M. P. Periaswami.
" A. Sambasivam.
" P. M. Munuswami Gounder.
" O. A. Nanjappa.
" V. Govindaswami Naidu.
" M. Dharmalingam.
" N. Paramasiva Udayar.

The Hon. Sri B. Parameswaran.
" S. S. Ramasami Pada-
yachi.

Dr. (Srimathi) T. S. Soundaram Rama-
chandran.

Sri T. K. Rama.
" M. S. Munuswamy Pillai.
" V. S. Chinnaswami Naidu.

Sri S. Chinnakaruppa Thevar.

" V. S. Sivaprakasam.
" A. Iyandar.
" V. Muthu.
" A. S. Subbaraj.
" S. Thinakarawami Thevar.
" V. Chinnayya.
" T. V. Sannasi.
" N. Rajagopal.
" R. M. Palaniappan.
" A. M. Ratnaswami.
" C. Muthiah Pillai.
" O. Chengam Pillai.
" Mohamed Salih Maraicair.
" M. C. Muthukumaraswami.
" V. Krishnaswami Padayachi.
" G. Vagheesam Pillai.
" A. S. Sahajananda.
" K. Parthasarathy.
" M. Jagannathan.
" P. S. Krishnaswamy Ayyangar.
" G. Govindan.
" AR. A. RM. Chockalingam Chettiar.
" M. Kandaswami Padayachi.
" R. Krishnaswami Naidu.
" P. Chellathurai.
" K. Shanmugam.
" R. V. Swaminathan.
" T. Ganapathi.
" V. Venuzopalakrishnaswami.
" A. Vaikuntam.
" R. S. Arumugam.
" V. Arumugam.
" P. B. K. Raja Chidambaram.
" P. Selvaraj.
" S. N. Somayajulu.
" I. K. Subramania Pillai.
" Y. Manjaya Shetty.
" K. Venkatramana Gowda.
" K. Ishwara.
" M. S. Mogral.
" B. Vaikunta Baliga.
" L. C. Pais.
" T. Ananta Pai.
" K. H. Bomman.
" G. Samia Koorayar.
" W. J. Fernandez.
" K. G. Palaniswamy Gounder.

24th November 1955]

Noes—118—cont.

Sri K. Aranganathan.	Sri N. Rathina Gounder.
„ A. Muthuswami.	„ K. R. Sambandam.
„ M. Kattimuthu.	„ P. Rathnaswami Pillai.
„ T. Manavalan.	„ T. Shanmugam.
„ S. Radhakrishnan.	„ A. Govindaswamy Nayagar.
„ S. Kandaswami Gounder.	„ A. Senspathi Gounder.
„ T. D. Muthukumaraswami Naidu.	„ P. Kandaswami Gounder.
„ K. R. Viswanathan.	„ A. K. Hanumantharaya Gounder.
„ V. Balakrishnan.	„ A. Veloo.
„ H. B. Ari Gounder.	„ R. Rangaswami Gounder.
„ S. Swayamprakasam.	„ K. Gajapathi Reddi.
„ K. Vinayakam.	„ S. T. Adityan.
„ S. Daivasigamoney.	„ M. Manickasundaram.

Neutrals—8.

Sri P. Ramamurthi.	Sri P. Jeevanandam.
„ M. Kalyanasundaram.	„ V. R. Krishna Ayyar.
„ K. P. Gopalan.	„ V. Madanagopal.
„ T. C. Narayanan Nambiar.	„ K. V. Ramaswami.

Ayes—17 ; Noes—118 ; Neutrals—8.

The amendment was lost.

MR. SPEAKER : I shall now put the amendment of Sri T. Ananta Pai to the vote of the House. The question is—

“ Add at the end the following :—

‘ and on such consideration this House recommends that three States of Kerala, Karnataka and Madras be formed and in the formation of Kerala and Karnataka States, the whole of Kasaragod taluk be added to the Karnataka State.’ ”

The motion was lost.

MR. SPEAKER : I will put the amendment moved by Sri N. N. ^{2-10 p.m.} Suvarna to vote. The first part of the amendment of Sri S. S. Kolkebil, the amendment of Sri Vaikunta Baliga, the amendment of Sri Y. Manjaya Shetty and the amendment of Sri M. S. Mogral are the same as the amendment of Sri N. N. Suvarna and all of them need not be put to vote.

SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR : Mr. Suvarna is not present in the House and his amendment cannot be put to vote.

SRI B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA : Sri Suvarna is not present. Since I am present here, I request that my amendment may be put to vote.

MR. SPEAKER : I must follow the rule . . .

SRI K. UPPI : On a point of order, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER : Mr. Uppi Sahib ought to know that, when the Speaker is on his legs, no member can raise a point of order.

[Mr. Speaker] [24th November 1955]

Mr. Ananta Pai stated that he was withdrawing the amendment of Sri Suvarna with the leave of the House, since Mr. Suvarna is not in the House. With the permission of the House, Suvarna's amendment is deemed to have been drawn.

SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP : On a point of order, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER : Order, order.

SRI K. UPPI : Sir, I rise on a very serious point of order. The amendment has been called for voting. Since the House is in possession of the amendment, the fate of the amendment has to be decided by a vote of the House. A Member has no right to withdraw after it has been called for vote.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : The amendment can be withdrawn at any time with the permission of the House. It was withdrawn with the permission of the House and it was declared withdrawn by the Speaker. Therefore no point of order can arise now.

SRI K. UPPI : The permission of the House was not given.

MR. SPEAKER : I asked for the permission of the House and a majority of the members by a voice vote gave the permission. Therefore the amendment was treated as withdrawn.

A similar amendment has been moved by Sri Vaikunta Baliga and I am putting it to vote. The amendment reads as follows

SRI S. S. KOLKEBAIL : I have given notice of a similar amendment. It was not put to vote and I have not withdrawn it.

MR. SPEAKER : There is absolutely no reason for heat in the matter. We can proceed with the matter with a little more calmness. Mr. Kolkebail's amendment consists of three portions. The first portion is about Kasaragod taluk, the second portion is about the inclusion of Hosur taluk in Karnataka and the third is about the inclusion of Talavadi firka in Karnataka. Instead of putting the omnibus amendment to vote, it has been split up into three parts for the purpose of putting to vote.

SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP : In that case I request that the first part of the amendment of Mr. Kolkebail may be put to vote.

MR. SPEAKER : An amendment can be split up and put to vote by parts or can be put to vote as a whole. I have now called the amendment of Mr. Vaikunta Baliga.

24th November 1955]

The amendment was put and the House divided thus:—

Ayes—100.

2-20
p.m.

The Hon. Sri A. B. Shetty.	Sri R. Krishnaswami Naidu.
M. A. Manickavelu.	G. Govindan.
Sri K. Rajaram.	M. Kandaswami Padayachi.
B. Bhakthavatsalu Naidu.	A. S. Sahajananda.
P. G. Karuthiruman.	G. Vagesam Pillai.
V. C. Palanisami Gounder.	V. Krishnaswami Padayachi.
B. K. Nallaswami.	R. V. Swaminathan.
S. C. Virupakshiah.	T. Ganapathi.
V. K. Palaniswami Gounder.	A. Vajkuntam.
P. K. Thirumurthy.	R. S. Arumugam.
R. Kuppuswami.	V. Venugopalakrishnaswami.
N. Mounaguruswami Naidu.	V. Arumugam.
S. R. Arumugam.	P. B. K. Rajachidambaram.
M. S. Selvarajan.	P. Selvaraj.
R. Krishnaswami Gopalar.	S. N. Somayajulu.
N. Ramakrishna Iyer.	K. Venkatramana Gowda.
K. Venkataswami Naidu.	I. K. Subramania Pillai.
Dr. U. Krishna Rao.	K. Ishwara.
Sri M. R. Ramachandran.	Y. Manjayya Shetty.
T. P. Elumalai.	M. S. Mogral.
V. K. Ramaswami Mudaliar.	B. Vaikunta Baliga.
S. Panchaksharam.	L. C. Pais.
H. M. Jagannatham.	T. Anantha Pai.
R. Thangavelu.	K. H. Bomman.
A. Ramachandra Reddiar.	G. Samia Koorayar.
M. P. Periaswami.	W. J. Fernandez.
A. Sambasivam.	K. G. Palaniswami Gounder.
P. M. Munuswami Gounder.	K. Aranganathan.
O. A. Nanjappa.	T. Manavalan.
V. Govindaswami Naidu.	S. Kandaswami Gounder.
M. Dharmalingam.	T. D. Muthukumaraswamy Naidu.
Dr. (Srimathi) T. S. Soundaram Rama-	K. R. Viswanathan.
chandran.	H. B. Ari Gowder.
Sri T. K. Rama.	V. Balakrishnan.
Sri M. S. Muniswami Pillai.	S. Swayamprakasam.
V. S. Chinnaaswami Naidu.	K. Vinayakam.
S. Chinnakaruppa Thevar.	S. Deivasigamoney.
V. S. Sivaprakasam.	N. Rathina Gounder.
A. Iyanar.	K. R. Sambandam.
V. Muthu.	P. Rathinaswami Pillai.
A. S. Subbaraj.	A. Govindaswamy Nayagar.
S. Thinakaradaswami Thevar.	A. Senapathi Gounder.
T. V. Sannasi.	P. Kandaswami Gounder.
R. M. Palaniappan.	A. K. Hanumanthayya Gounder.
A. M. Rathnaswami.	A. Veloo.
C. Muthiah Pillai.	R. Rangaswami Gounder.
O. Chengam Pillai.	S. S. Kolkeball.
K. Parthasarathy.	K. Gajapathi Reddi.
Ar. A. Rm. Chockalingam Chettiar.	S. T. Adityan.
P. Chellathurai.	M. Manickesunderam.
K. Shanmugam.	

Noes—18.

Sri V. R. Krishna Ayyar.	Sri O. Koran.
K. T. Sridharan.	C. Velukkan.
M. Narayana Kurup.	K. Uppi.
C. Kunhirama Kurup.	C. Ahmad Kutty.
V. Sankaranarayana Menon.	K. Kunh. Mohamed Shafee.
M. K. Padmaprabha Gounder.	M. Chadayan.
M. Narayana Nambiar.	E. K. Sankara Varma Raja.
P. Kunhirama Kidav.	A. Appu.
K. Moidu.	K. P. Kuttikrishnan Nair.

[24th November 1955]

Neutrals—14.

The Hon. Sri C. Subramaniam.

" B. Parameswaran.

" S. S. Ramasami Padaya-
chi.

Sri M. Jagannathan.

" P. S. Krishnaswami Ayyangar.

" A. Muthuswami.

" M. Kattimuthu.

Sri S. Radhakrishnan.

" P. Ramamurthi.

" M. Kalyanasundaram.

" K. P. Gopalan.

" P. Jeevanandam.

" S. Ramalingam.

" V. Madanagopal.

Ayes—100; Noes—18; Neutrals—14.

SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP: Is it in order in the course of the voting in this House to pull certain Members and also to show signs to them to rise?

MR. SPEAKER: I cannot say that it is in order. But if the hon. Member had pointed out at the time that any such irregularity happened, of course, I could have taken notice of it.

SRI P. CHELLATHURAI: கனம் சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே, தூங்கிக்கொண்டிருக்கும் மெம்பர்களை எழுப்புவது ஒழுங்குக்கு விரோதம் ஆகுமா?

MR. SPEAKER: தூங்கிக்கொண்டிருப்பவர்களை எழுப்புவது உங்களுடைய கடமை என்றே நான் நினைக்கிறேன்.

SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP: It was exactly this that I wanted to point out to the Chair. But I was not allowed to do it on the ground that voting was going on.

MR. SPEAKER: I do not think that there is anything wrong if a person is half asleep, in waking him up and telling him, "Voting is going on. Participate in the voting". (Laughter.)

AN HON. MEMBER: Can a Member sleep in the Assembly?

MR. SPEAKER: I am not here to answer hypothetical questions. If a Member sleeps actually in the Chamber and if it is brought to my notice on a point of order, a ruling can be given. But hypothetical questions like this cannot be asked.

SRI R. V. SWAMINATHAN: May I submit, Sir, that according to Parliamentary Practice, Members are allowed to sleep but are only prevented from snoring?

MR. SPEAKER: I think the hon. Member is perfectly right. The result of the ballot is:

Ayes—100; Noes—18; Neutrals—14.

The amendment was carried.

2-30 p.m. MR. SPEAKER: The other amendments (amendment of Sri Manjappa Shetty and Sri M. S. Mogral) relate to the same matter. So, they will not be put. I would request hon. Members not to leave the premises until the entire voting is over. I shall now put

24th November 1955] [Mr. Speaker]

the amendment of Sri S. S. Kolkebail. There are three portions to it. I would like to know whether Mr. Kolkebail is withdrawing any of these amendments.

SRI S. S. KOLKEBAIL: Sir, we are considering the entire Report of the States Reorganization Commission. The Hosur taluk and the Talavadi firka of Gobichettipalayam taluk are also in the Madras State.

MR. SPEAKER: Then, do you want parts (2) and (3) of the amendment to be split up and put to the vote of the House separately?

SRI S. S. KOLKEBAIL: They may be taken jointly, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is—

“Add at the end the following:—

‘and on such consideration this Assembly recommends—
inclusion of Hosur taluk of Salem district in Karnataka; and
inclusion of Talavadi firka of Gobichettipalayam taluk,
Coimbatore district in Karnataka.’ ”

The amendments were put and lost.

MR. SPEAKER: Now, I will take up amendment No. 3. I would like to know from Mr. Swayamprakasam whether he is withdrawing the amendment.

SRI S. SWAYAMPRAKASAM: In view of the assurance given by the Hon. the Leader of the House that this question may be considered at the Bill stage, I am withdrawing it, Sir.

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

The amendment of Sri K. Vinayakam was also, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. SPEAKER: I shall take up amendment No. 4 of Sri A. Ratnam. As he is absent, the amendment is deemed as withdrawn.

Amendment No. 16 was, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. SPEAKER: Then, we shall take up amendment No. 12. I would like to know whether the hon. Member Sri Vinayakam is pressing that.

SRI K. VINAYAKAM: Sir, this particular amendment was moved by me with reference to paragraph 396 of the Report of the States Reorganization Commission. The Hon. the Leader of the House judiciously avoided mentioning anything about this nor has he touched upon it in his winding up speech. May I know, Sir, the attitude of the Government in the matter?

[24th November 1955]

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : The hon. Member knows the steps we have taken so far with reference to this question. We are awaiting the reply of the Andhra Government and in case we are unable to come to an agreement, it will be referred to a boundary commission.

SRI K. VINAYAKAM : I am fully satisfied, Sir. In view of the assurance given by the Government, I am withdrawing the amendment.

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. SPEAKER : I shall now take up amendment No. 18. I would like to know whether Sri Selvarajan is withdrawing it.

SRI M. S. SELVARAJAN : I am not withdrawing, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER : The question is—

“Add at the end the following :—

‘and on such consideration this House is of the view that the islands of Laccadive, Amindive and Minicoy may be constituted into a centrally administered area.’ ”

The amendment was put and carried.

MR. SPEAKER : I shall now put the amendment of Sri Ari Gowder (No. 22) to the vote of the House. Is the hon. Member withdrawing the amendment?

SRI H. B. ARI GOWDER : I am pressing, Sir . . .

MR. SPEAKER : Let me have a definite statement from the hon. Member.

SRI H. B. ARI GOWDER : I am pressing it, but not pressing it to a division.

MR. SPEAKER : The question of putting it to division does not arise now. Is the hon. Member pressing or withdrawing his amendment?

SRI H. B. ARI GOWDER : Let a voice vote be taken please.

MR. SPEAKER : Yes. The question is—

“Add at the end the following :—

‘and on such consideration this House recommends that three States, viz., Madras, Kerala and Karnataka be formed and that in so forming the whole of the Nilgiri district be allotted to Karnataka.’ ”

The amendment was put and lost.

24th November 1955]

MR. SPEAKER: I will put the main motion as amended. The question is—

“That the Report of the States Reorganization Commission be taken into consideration and on such consideration this House accords its general approval to the proposals of the States Reorganization Commission to form a Kerala State and a Karnataka State with such border adjustments as may be found necessary, is of the opinion that the areas of Devikulam and Peermede which form an integral part of Tamil Nad, contiguous to the Tamil areas with a large Tamil majority should also be transferred to the Madras State subject to such border adjustments as may be found necessary, that in forming the Kerala and Karnataka States the northern arm of the Chandragiri river be fixed as the boundary and the portion to the north of the river be allotted to Karnataka and that to the south of the river alone be allotted to Kerala and that the islands of Laccadive, Amindive and Minicoy may be constituted into a Centrally Administered area.”

The motion, as amended, was put and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: I want to inform hon. Members that to-morrow we have to meet at 8-30 a.m. instead of at 9 a.m.

The House will now adjourn and meet again at 8-30 a.m. to-morrow.

The House then adjourned.

IV.—PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE OF THE HOUSE.

1. *The Madras General Sales Tax (Third Amendment) Bill, 1955.*
2. *The Madras General Sales Tax (Fourth Amendment) Bill, 1955.*
3. *The Madras Money Lenders Bill, 1955.*
4. *The Madras Canals and Public Ferries (Amendment) Bill, 1955.*
5. *The Madras Preservation of Private Forests (Amendment) Bill, 1955.*

[24th November 1955]

APPENDIX I.

[Vide answer to starred question No. 2807 asked by Sri A. Ratnam at the meeting of the Legislative Assembly held on 24th November 1955, page 338 supra.]

Ameliorative measures taken towards Harijan uplift in Madurai district.

(a) *Extent of land assigned to Harijans in Madurai district in the year 1952.*—An extent of 8.17 acres of Government land was assigned to Harijans in 1952. No private land was acquired for assignment to Harijans in the year 1952.

(b) *Number of wells sunk in the district for the uplift of the Harijans in the year 1952.*—Twenty new wells were sunk for the benefit of the Harijans under the Rural Water-supply Scheme and nine existing wells were repaired under the Harijan Welfare Scheme.

(c) *Other ameliorative steps taken in the district towards Harijan uplift since the present Collector took charge.*—The following expenditure was sanctioned towards ameliorative measures from July 1954 (when the present Collector took charge) to 31st August 1955 :—

Items.	Amount spent.		
	RS.	A.	P.
1 Scholarships—			
(a) Eligible communities and converts.	75,436	2	3
(b) Backward Classes	3,544	7	0
	1,63,801	8	9
2 Boarding grants—			
(a) Eligible communities	1,43,859	1	5
(b) Backward Classes	42,586	0	0
3 Exemption from payment of examination fees	391	8	0
4 Construction of bath rooms	7,653	0	0
5 Repairs of wells under the Harijan Welfare Scheme	1,957	0	0
6 Book grants to Harijans	784	0	0
	up to 31st March 1955.		
7 Acquisition of land for house-sites	7,260	0	0
8 Construction of 1st houses for Nari-koravars (ex-Criminal Tribes)	3,600	0	0
9 Construction of a new hostel building for Pulayar children and quarters for the warden of Thandigudi	4,000	0	0

24th November 1955]

Items.	Amount spent,		
	RS.	A.	P.
10 Purchase of blankets for distribution to the Pulayars of Lower Palani Hills as an antimalarial measure.	1,050	0	0
11 Grant of rewards at Rs. 50 each to the three social workers for doing meritorious service for the cause of removal of untouchability.	150	0	0
12 Opening of two Harijan Welfare schools with mid-day meals, one at Ramanathapuram and the other at Sankaralingapuram.	Separate figures not available		
13 Opening of one Elementary school at Nallurkaduvalavu and one new hostel at Thandigudi for Pulayar children.	Do.		
A sum of Rs. 5,860 was spent up to 31st March 1955 on the maintenance of the hostel.			
14 Grant at the District Harijan Sevak Sangh towards boarding grants and clothing and book allowances for 40 Adivasi boarders maintained in various hostels in the district.	6,400	0	0
15 Appointment of two Deputy Sevaks and two Assistants for doing effective propaganda for the removal of untouchability.	Separate figures not available.		

(d) *Expenditure incurred from the Budget allotment towards establishment charges and the actual amount of subsidy and aid given for Harijans in the year 1952.*—Rs. 15,467-8-9 towards the cost of office establishment, Rs. 15,435-7-0 towards the pay of teachers and Rs. 1,19,018-4-6 towards grant, subsidy and mid-day meals.

APPENDIX II.

[Vide answer to starred question No. 2808 asked by Sri M. Chadayan at the meeting of the Legislative Assembly held on 24th November 1955, page 338 supra.]

A Harijan named Nanu and a Thiya woman named Panchali met at Cheruthazham and grew intimate with each other. Panchali seems to have agreed to marry Nanu, as she was made to understand that Nanu was also a Thiya. On the 18th of May last, she left her house at Cheruthazham for Cannanore. Nanu met her at the Railway station as previously arranged and they got their marriage registered at the office of the Sub-Registrar on 20th May, 1955. Thereafter they were living at Chirakkal.

24th November 1955]

Very soon, Panchali seems to have found that Nanu was not of her caste, and she appears to have written to her people to come and take her home. On the 24th of May, four persons from Cheruthazham who are all related to Panchali and five others from Chirakkal went to Nanu's house, but it seems Panchali refused to go with them because Nanu and his father had forced her to say so.

In the meanwhile, Nanu's father Vattiyann complained to the Village Munsif, Chirakkal, that on the midnight of 24th May, nine persons came to his house, broke the bars of the windows, forced him to open the door and restore his daughter-in-law Panchali, and also beat him, his son Nanu and daughter-in-law Panchali. The village munsif sent his report to the Baliapatam Police station. It was registered as Crime No. 53 of 1955 under Sections 147, 448 and 323, I.P.C., and the case was investigated. The investigation revealed that the nine persons who went to bring back Panchali to her place, entered Nanu's house in good faith with the intention of tracing the missing woman and that they had not committed any mischief or assault.



APPENDIX III.

[Vide answer to starred question No. 2823 asked by Sri K. Vinayakam at the meeting of the Legislative Assembly held on 24th November 1955, page 349 supra.]

Admission of students in the Central Polytechnics, Madras.

(1)	Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes.					Backward Classes.					Others.				
	Number applied.	Number eligible.	Number interviewed.	Number selected.	Number joined.	Number applied.	Number eligible.	Number interviewed.	Number selected.	Number joined.	Number applied.	Number eligible.	Number interviewed.	Number selected.	Number joined.
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)
Civil Engineering	10	10	8	8	8	108	107	87	43	36	248	231	220	62	57
Electrical Engineering	2	1	2	1	1	63	60	56	23	23	110	102	97	30	26
Mechanical Engineering	5*	1	5	1	1	80	77	71	21	21	212	198	184	37	33
Sanitary Engineering	..	..	..	..	..	8	..	8	8	6	7	..	5	5	4
Transferred from other courses ..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	5	5	..	..	..	9	9
Printing Technology	..	..	..	..	..	2	..	2	2	2	33	..	24	24	16
Transferred from other courses ..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	3	3	..	..	..	4	4
Fisheries Technology and Navigation.	..	..	..	..	..	3	..	3	3	3	7	..	5	5	4
Transferred from other courses ..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	6	6	..	..	..	2	2
Cinematography and Sound Engineering.	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	14	..	10	9	3
Grand total	17	12	15	10	10	264	244	227	114	105	631	531	545	187	158

Total admitted—273. Percentage of admission—Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes 3·7 per cent, Backward Classes 38·5 per cent and other* 57·8 per cent.

All the candidates who applied were called for interview.

* Four belong to other States hence not admitted.

24th November 1955]

